178
178

Religion and Drink

By
THE REV. E. A. WASSON, Ph.D.
Rector of
St. Stephen's Episcopal Church
Newark, N. J.

Search the scriptures.—John 5.39.
Lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God.—Acts 5.39.
The truth shall make you free.—John 8.32.

New York
BURR PRINTING HOUSE
1914

Theological Seminary Library.
Drew University Library
Madison, New Jersey

178.1
W323r

Copyright, 1914, By
E. A. Wasson

DREW THEOLOGICAL
NOV 13 1914
SEMINARY LIBRARY

THE PREFACE

The word drink in this book means those alcoholic beverages spoken of in the Bible. The conclusions apply, strictly, only to those particular beverages. But, naturally, they apply, by analogy, for certain purposes, to other alcoholic drinks that are no more hazardous. For example; if wine is right, beer is.

In the composition of this book I gratefully acknowledge valuable suggestions from my learned friend, Mr. Walter J. Kidd.

What is God's will for us in the matter of drink? This book is an attempt to answer that question; and no other.

As far as I know, mine is the first examination of this question, on so extensive a scale, in the English language. This is remarkable, too, in view of the fact that the religious aspect of the drink question is the really vital and critical one for millions and millions of people; and of the further fact that around all other sides of the question veritable libraries have been built up.

The answer I seek in the Bible and the Church; —the Church, I say, not some division of it; but the Church as a whole, the Church Universal.

The chapters on the Old and New Testaments may look hard and uninteresting, because of the Hebrew and Greek words recurring so frequently. But, after all, there are only four of these, and

Compliments of The Author

125929

a little attention to them will not only overcome the very slight difficulty, but will place the English reader in as favorable a situation for judging the Bible evidence on the subject of drink as the student of Hebrew and Greek. Without the citation of these few original words I do not see how this could be done. And no one with any serious interest in the subject will begrudge the slight labor called for in these chapters.

All I ask is that my readers read this book with open minds, knowing that only error and wrong shun the light. However passionate our convictions, we should surrender them, if proved wrong, as loyal servants of Him who enjoins us to cut off hand or foot, yes, to pluck out the eye, that offend, and cast them from us.

Not only ought we to surrender our error; we shall have to surrender it sooner or later, willy-nilly. For this we may be sure of,—God's way will stand, not ours. Our passions, prejudices, ignorances will injure ourselves; they will injure others; they will retard the truth; but prevail they will not. At last we must come to God's way and God's truth. At last we must come to it; why not, rather, at first?

Bias and passion, then, in this matter should be put away. They merely impede a good cause; one who believes he is right can afford to be moderate and calm. The theologian, at the court of James I., who was being worsted in the argument, spat in his opponent's face. "That", said the latter, quietly wiping his cheek with his handkerchief, "is only a digression. Let us now resume the argument".

Does God forbid or allow alcoholic drink? It is not for you or me to say; it is for God's Word and God's Church. *To the law and to the testimony! If they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them* (Is. 8.20).

In what quarter lies the morning? In what, the night?

Newark, N. J. E. A. WASSON.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/religiondrink0000eawa

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE 3

PART ONE—THE BIBLE

CHAPTER I

THE OLD TESTAMENT ITSELF 9

CHAPTER II

OUTSIDE AUTHORITIES 44

CHAPTER III

THE GOSPELS 68

CHAPTER IV

THE EPISTLES 97

PART TWO—THE CHURCH

CHAPTER I

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH 131

CHAPTER II

THE FATHERS 140

CHAPTER III

THE MIDDLE AGES 159

CHAPTER IV

THE REFORMATION 164

PAGE

CHAPTER V

The Temperance Movement 185

CHAPTER VI

Prohibition 204

CHAPTER VII

Intemperance 223

PART THREE—THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL

CHAPTER I

Religion and Law 244

CHAPTER II

Character and Coddling 269

CHAPTER III

The New and Living Way 281

Conclusion 293

Index 299

PART ONE
THE BIBLE

CHAPTER I

THE OLD TESTAMENT ITSELF

If the English version of the Old Testament represents the original Hebrew correctly, then wine and "strong drink" are, in these Scriptures, sometimes approved and sometimes condemned. Isaiah thinks well of wine when he prophesies (Is. 25.6), "In this mountain will Jehovah of hosts make unto all peoples a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined". He would no more have written thus of wine, if he had thought ill of it, than a white ribboner of today would hold forth an abundance of superior whiskey as a charm of the millenium.

Very different are the words of Proverbs (20.1) about these beverages: "Wine is a mocker, strong drink a brawler".

Other passages could be cited for both these sentiments.

There are three possible explanations of this seeming discord. First, the sacred writers really disagreed about wine and "strong drink". Second, where they seem to disagree, they are, in fact, talking of different things. Third, they are

talking of the same thing, but the one is speaking of its proper use and the other of its misuse.

The first supposition,—that the sacred writers contradict each other,—will be rejected by all who believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and need not be examined. The second supposition,—that where one praises and the other censures wine they are speaking of two entirely different beverages, clearly distinguished in the Hebrew, but confused under one head in our English translation,—has been vigorously maintained, and will now be examined in some detail. Let not the reader be frightened off from this examination by its statistical and monotonous appearance, for it is important. Besides, it will be easy and interesting, if you really care to go into the subject.

The English word wine, in the Old Testament, represents eleven Hebrew words; or, if we use the Revised Version, either English or American, eight Hebrew words. The term "strong drink" always represents the same Hebrew word. Of the words for wine two are very common, and it is admitted by all that these two are decisive as to the issue in hand. To them, therefore, we shall confine ourselves. These words are *yayin* and *tirosh*. It is contended that yayin stands for fermented wine, and tirosh for unfermented grape-juice, the one alcoholic and the other non-alcoholic; and that the wine which is praised in the Old Testament is tirosh, whereas yayin is condemned and forbidden. If this is so, the Old Testament enjoins total abstinence, and its saints and seers practised it. If this is so, too, the trans-

lators of the Bible, not only into English, but into all other languages, ancient and modern, have been guilty of grievous sin or grievous ignorance in failing to make this vital distinction as clear in their translations as it was in the original. They have thus confused light and darkness, good and evil, to the peril of souls. It must have happened in numberless instances that the supposed word of God, in place of a guide to salvation, became thus a lure to destruction.

I

Yayin.—This word occurs in the Old Testament nearly 150 times. The following passages prove that yayin could intoxicate:

And Noah . . . drank of the yayin, and was drunken (Gen. 9.20-21).

The two daughters of Lot "made their father drink yayin", till he did not know what he was doing (Gen. 19.32-35).

Eli (1 Sam. 1.14), mistaking Hannah's excitement, "said unto her, How long wilt thou be drunken? put away thy yayin from thee". To this she replied, "I have drunk neither yayin nor strong drink". This passage shows that "strong drink" also could intoxicate.

"Nabal's heart was merry within him, for he was very drunken: wherefore Abigail [his wife] told him nothing, less or more, until the morning light. And it came to pass in the morning, when the yayin was gone out of Nabal, that his wife told him these things, and his heart died within him, and he became as a stone" (1 Sam. 25.36-37).

The Psalmist declares (Ps. 60.3),

Thou hast showed thy people hard things:
Thou hast made us to drink the yayin of staggering.

And Proverbs,

Yayin is a mocker, strong drink a brawler (Pro. 20.1).

Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions?
Who hath complaining? who hath wounds without cause?
Who hath redness of eyes?

They that tarry long at the yayin;
They that go to seek out mixed wine.

Look not thou upon the yayin when it is red,
When it sparkleth in the cup,
When it goeth down smoothly:
At the last it biteth like a serpent,
And stingeth like an adder (Pro. 23.29-32).

And here is one of the "oracles" that the mother of king Lemuel taught him (Pro. 31.4):

It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink yayin;
Nor for princes to say, Where is strong drink?

Isaiah adds his witness, "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink; that tarry late into the night, till yayin inflame them".—Is. 5.11.

"Woe to the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephraim, and to the fading flower of his glori-

ous beauty, which is on the head of the fat valley of them that are overcome with yayin!" (Is. 28.1)

"And even these reel with yayin, and stagger with strong drink; the priest and the prophet reel with strong drink, they are swallowed up of yayin, they stagger with strong drink" (Is. 28.7).

Jeremiah (23.9) compares himself to "a drunken man, and like a man whom yayin hath overcome".

The same prophet is ordered by Jehovah to "take this cup of the yayin of wrath at my hand, and cause all the nations, to whom I send thee, to drink it. And they shall drink, and reel to and fro, and be mad" (Jer. 25.15-16).

By Jeremiah also Jehovah declares: "Babylon hath been a golden cup in Jehovah's hand, that made all the earth drunken: the nations have drunk of her yayin; therefore the nations are mad" (Jer. 51.7).

Hosea plainly asserts that "whoredom and yayin and new wine take away the understanding" (Hos. 4.11). And in 7.5 he tells how "the princes made themselves sick with the heat of yayin".

Joel taunts the drunkards because the vineyards have been destroyed: "Awake, ye drunkards, and weep; and wail, all ye drinkers of yayin, because of the sweet wine; for it is cut off from your mouth" (Joel 1.5).

If the translation by the Revised Version of Habbakuk 2.5, be accepted, then "yayin is treacherous, a haughty man, that keepeth not at home; who enlargeth his desire as Sheol, and he is as

death, and cannot be satisfied, but gathereth unto him all nations, and heapeth unto him all peoples".

Now it would be too preposterous to say of beverages like water or milk or fresh grape juice that they were "treacherous", to compare them to "a haughty man, that keepeth not at home; who enlargeth his desire as Sheol, and he is as death and cannot be satisfied", and to say the other terrible things about them that the passages quoted say about yayin. Yayin is plainly something that can intoxicate. It is wine, just what people mean today and always have meant by wine, the wine that comes from the grape.

These passages show, too, that "strong drink" was different from this alcoholic wine, but that it likewise could intoxicate. Scholars are not agreed as to what it was. Many think it was a wine made from dates, the same as is made today by Mohammedans who have not the fear of their Prophet before them. Others think that "strong drink" was made from pomegranates; still others, that it was a beer, or ale, brewed from barley, such as was anciently made in Egypt. But, whatever it was, "strong drink" could intoxicate, and it stands or falls with yayin.

But this is not all the Old Testament has to say about yayin. It has much more and of quite a different tenor. For example, we read (Gen. 14.18) that "Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and yayin: and he was priest of God Most High", and gave them to Abram and his followers.

Of another worthy, the dying Isaac, Gen. 27.25

tells how Jacob "brought him yayin, and he drank".

Jacob, in his final blessing, prophesies for Judah (Gen. 49.12),

> His eyes shall be red with yayin,
> And his teeth white with milk.

This means that Judah shall drink yayin even to the point of exhilaration.

Most significant is the fact that Jehovah requires yayin to be offered to himself twice daily, as an ordinance forever, in the sacrifice. Here is a passage ordaining this as divine law: "Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar: . . . The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even: . . . and the fourth part of a hin of yayin for a drink-offering" (Ex. 29.38-40).

On the sabbath Jehovah required that the quantity of his yayin be doubled (Num. 28.9).

But Jehovah was not content with yayin at these daily sacrifices,—he demanded yayin also with the occasional offerings: "When ye . . . will make an offering by fire unto Jehovah, a burnt-offering, or a sacrifice to accomplish a vow, or as a free-will offering, or in your set feasts . . . then shall he that offereth his oblation offer unto Jehovah . . . yayin for the drink offering, the fourth part of a hin . . . the third part of a hin of yayin, of a sweet savor unto Jehovah . . . half a hin [the quantity depending on whether a lamb or a ram or a bullock was offered]

. . . and thou shalt offer for the drink-offering half a hin of yayin" (Num. 15.2-10).

When the sheaf of the firstfruits was waved by the priest, Jehovah required yayin: "the drink offering thereof shall be of yayin, the fourth part of a hin" (Lev. 23.13).

However, then, it may have been with God's people, yayin was not forbidden to God himself. He demanded daily three quarts of it, and on the sabbath (Num. 28.9-10) six quarts; and the least amount that he would accept at a special sacrifice was a pint and a half. In fact, it is not going too far to say that without yayin was no formal approach to Jehovah.

Now God's offerings must be of the best, without blemish, perfect. Nothing faulty, let alone evil, could be offered him (except the broken and contrite heart). Hence God must have approved of yayin.

Again; God demanded yayin in his worship daily: in consequence, his people were required to make and have it on hand in large quantities. From this they would inevitably come to look on it as a lawful beverage; reasoning, correctly, that what was good enough for God was good enough for them. What is right in church cannot be wrong out of church: as those churches reason that today exclude yayin from the Holy Communion. If it is right in church, it is right everywhere: the altar sanctifies the gift. Thus God's people would have been led to drink by the very example of God himself. It is a certainty, there-

fore, that yayin, being acceptable to God, was not forbidden to his people.

It is true, on the other hand, that there was a prohibition of yayin,—to priests on service, "And Jehovah spake unto Aaron, saying, Drink no wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tent of meeting" (Lev. 10.8-9). A natural reason for this prohibition is that, yayin being intoxicating in excess, there was danger that a priest might create a scandal by being under its influence while officiating. If God had meant, in these words, to forbid the priests ever to drink, he would not have added, "when ye go into the tent of meeting". How terse and unmistakable would have been, "Drink no wine, nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, forever". That is the way the law would read today in a denomination committed to total abstinence. It would not add, "just before and during service".

Another thing. In that Levitical prohibition the words, "Jehovah spake unto Aaron", are significant. They are not, "Jehovah spake unto the children of Israel". Yet, if wine had been forbidden to everyone, no special prohibition would have been needed for the priests.

But the Nazirite was required to abstain from wine and "strong drink" altogether. Let us give the whole of this part of his obligation: "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When either man or woman shall make a special vow, the vow of a Nazirite, to separate himself unto Jehovah, he shall separate himself from yayin and strong

drink; he shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink, neither shall he drink any juice of grapes, nor eat fresh grapes or dried. All the days of his separation shall he eat nothing that is made of the grapevine, from the kernels, even to the husk" (Num. 6.1-4).

Why the grape and its products were forbidden to the Nazirite does not concern us. But it does concern us that the prohibition of yayin is associated with these other indulgences clearly lawful, as well as, in addition, with hair-cutting: "All the days of his vow of separation there shall no razor come upon his head . . . he shall let the locks of the hair of his head grow long" (Num. 6.5). Yayin was forbidden, but so was unfermented grape juice. And the release from the vow carried the allowance of yayin, as well as of the rest: when the days of his separation are fulfilled, "after that the Nazirite may drink yayin" (Num. 6.20).

Later, the Rechabites were total abstainers. Their story is in Jer. 35. The reason they gave for their course was as follows: "We will drink no yayin; for Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father [father stands for a remote ancestor], commanded us, saying, Ye shall drink no yayin, neither ye, nor your sons, forever: neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any; but all your days ye shall dwell in tents; that ye may live many days in the land wherein ye sojourn" (verses 6-8).

In the days of Jonadab, "The Rechabites, of whom he was doubtless chief, were a nomad tribe

. . . and zealous worshippers of Jehovah. In the natural course of events they would have followed the example of the Israelites, once their fellow-nomads, and settled down as farmers and townsmen. Probably the process was beginning in the time of Jonadab; but that chief nipped it in the bud, and induced his followers to make their ancient nomadic habits of religious obligation. He had no leanings to asceticism, and his ordinances were not intended to make his followers ascetics. He forbade wine, but the term wine is to be understood strictly; there is no prohibition of any other intoxicant. His motives would be two-fold. First, the nomad regards agriculture and city life as meaner, less manly, less spiritual than his own. Jonadab wished to keep his clan to the higher life. Moreover, when the Israelites surrendered nomad life to settle on the farms and in towns, they corrupted their worship of Jehovah by combining it with the superstitions and immoral rites of the Canaanite baals, to whom, as they thought, they owed their corn and wine and oil ['for she did not know that I gave her the grain, and the new wine, and the oil . . . which they used for Baal.'—Hos. 2.8]. Recently, under Ahab and Jezebel, the worship of Baal had greatly developed. The cultivation of corn and of the vine seemed to lead directly to Baal-worship; and it would seem to Jonadab that by cutting off his people from any connection with agriculture he would preserve the purity and simplicity of their ancient worship of Jehovah''.

The above is the account given by the Rev.

William Henry Bennett, M. A., Litt. D., D. D., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in Hackney and New Colleges, London; and it is the account that virtually all students of the subject concur in. Therefore, any persons who today feel like becoming Rechabites, if they wish to be genuine, must vacate their houses and set up tents to live in; and they must not sow seed; in addition to abstaining from wine. The whole body of farmers are thus debarred by their occupation from the privilege of membership in this great order.

Note, too, an inference from the words of Jeremiah, "in the house of Jehovah",—"And I set before the sons of the house of the Rechabites bowls full of yayin, and cups; and I said unto them, Drink ye yayin" (Jer. 35.5). Evidently a large supply (there must have been a considerable number of Rechabites to be served) of yayin was kept in God's house.

Deuteronomy, 14.24-26, is, by itself, conclusive as to the attitude of the Old Testament toward both wine (yayin) and "strong drink". The subject is the eating of the tithe of the crops. This must be done "in the place which Jehovah shall choose, to cause his name to dwell there"; that is, at Jerusalem. But this requirement would be a hardship to those dwelling at a distance, and for these it is commuted in the following fashion: "And, if the way be too long for thee, so that thou art not able to carry it [the tithe], because the place is too far from thee which Jehovah thy God shall choose, to set his name there . . . then shalt thou turn it [the fruits of the field] into

money, and bind up the money in thy hand, and shalt go unto the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose: and thou shalt bestow the money for whatsoever thy soul desireth, for oxen or for sheep, or for yayin, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul asketh of thee; and thou shalt eat there before Jehovah thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household". Mark, it was Jehovah himself that, through Moses, told his servants to buy wine (yayin) and "strong drink" and to enjoy themselves with them. And there is much more of like tenor. For example, Deut. 28.39 threatens as a punishment of disobedience to God, "Thou shalt plant vineyards and dress them, but thou shalt neither drink of the yayin, nor gather the grapes".

So does Micah 6.15: "Thou shalt sow, but shalt not reap; thou shalt tread the olives, but shalt not anoint thee with oil; and the vintage, but shalt not drink the yayin".

So does Zephaniah 1.13: "And their wealth shall become a spoil, and their houses a desolation: yea, they shall build houses, but shall not inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, but shall not drink the yayin thereof".

In the following passage Isaiah makes the want of wine, if not of "strong drink" also, a token of "the coming world catastrophe", or as he called it "the curse"; "Therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, . . . therefore the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left. The new wine mourneth, the vine languisheth, all the merryhearted do sigh. The mirth of tabrets

ceaseth, the noise of them that rejoice endeth, the joy of the harp ceaseth. They shall not drink yayin with a song [because there will be none to drink]; strong drink shall be bitter to them that drink it. . . . There is a crying in the streets because of the yayin; all joy is darkened, the mirth of the land is gone. In the city is left desolation, and the gate is smitten with destruction'' (Is. 24.6-12).

Moses, speaking of the miraculous way in which Jehovah had provided for his people in the wilderness, with water from the rock and manna from heaven, says, ''Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drunk yayin or strong drink'' (Deut. 29.6); as though their usual and natural beverages would have been wine and ''strong drink'', as their natural food would have been bread.

Hannah took the little Samuel to the house of Jehovah, to dedicate him to the service of Jehovah there; and with him she brought ''three bullocks, one ephah of meal, and a bottle of yayin'' (1 Sam. 1.24). In the same way yayin is associated with foods and other necessaries dozens of times, without a hint that, while they were allowed, it was banned. Thus Samuel tells Saul, ''Thou shalt come to the oak of Tabor; and there shall meet thee there three men going up to God to Beth-el, one carrying three kids, and another carrying three loaves of bread, and another carrying a bottle of yayin'' (1 Sam. 10.3). ''And Jesse took an ass laden with bread, and a bottle of yayin, and a kid, and sent them by David his son unto Saul'' (1 Sam. 16.20). ''When David was a little past the top of

the ascent, behold, Ziba . . . met him, with a couple of asses saddled, and upon them two hundred loaves of bread, and a hundred clusters of raisins, and a hundred of summer fruits, and a bottle of yayin. . . . And Ziba said, The asses are for the king's household to ride on; and the bread and summer fruit for the young men to eat; and the yayin, that such as are faint in the wilderness may drink'' (2 Sam. 16.1-2). According to 1 Ch. 9.27-29, the four chief porters ''lodged round about the house of God'', because they were responsible for the furniture and all the vessels of the sanctuary and the fine flour and the yayin and the oil and the frankincense and the spices. Those who helped to make David king ''brought bread on asses, and on camels, and on mules, and on oxen, victuals of meal, cakes of figs, and clusters of raisins, and yayin, and oil, and oxen, and sheep in abundance: for there was joy in Israel'' (1 Ch. 12.40). Solomon promised to give the servants of Hiram, king of Tyre, the hewers that cut timber, ''twenty thousand measures of beaten wheat, and twenty thousand measures of barley, and twenty thousand baths of yayin [180,000 gallons], and twenty thousand baths of oil'' (2 Ch. 2.10). ''And Rehoboam fortified the strongholds, and put . . . in them . . . stores of victuals, and oil and yayin'' (2 Ch. 11.11). Pious Nehemiah prays that God may remember him for good because, with all else that he had done for his brethren, he had contributed daily to their support, ''one ox and six choice sheep; also fowls . . . ; and once in

ten days store of all sorts of yayin" (Neh. 5.18).

Proverbs declares:

> He that loveth pleasure shall be a poor man:
> He that loveth yayin and oil shall not be rich (21.17).

Now pleasure and oil have their place in life: it follows, in this passage, that wine has, too.

The Preacher enjoins, "Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy yayin with a merry heart" (Ecc. 9.7); also, "A feast is made for laughter, and yayin maketh glad the life; and money answereth all things" (Ecc. 10.19).

In the following stanza from the Song of Solomon (5.1), wine is in good company:

I am come into my garden, my sister, my bride:
I have gathered my myrrh with my spice;
I have eaten my honeycomb with my honey;
I have drunk my yayin with my milk.
Eat, O friends;
Drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved.

Other passages in the Song of Songs show that yayin was held in very high honor. Thus the maiden exalts her love by this figure:

> For thy love is better than yayin (1.2).

But, if yayin was an evil and injurious thing, this would be an absurd anti-climax; like saying today, "I would rather have your love than wood-alcohol".

So, again, two verses later:

> We will make mention of thy love more than of yayin.

This comparison appealed to the poet as specially felicitous and strong; for in 4.10 he comes back to it:

How much better is thy love than yayin!

Isaiah, showing how even good things can be used amiss, includes yayin among them: "The harp and the lute, the tabret and the pipe, and yayin, are in their feasts; but they regard not the work of Jehovah" (Is. 5.12). He reproves the nation because, when God called to repentance, "Behold, joy and gladness, slaying oxen and killing sheep, eating flesh and drinking yayin" (Is. 22.13). And Jehovah thus announces his great call of free mercy, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy yayin and milk without money and without price" (Is. 55.1). It is God himself that urges his people to come and drink wine and milk "without money and without price". It is true that this is a figure of speech. But in figures of speech there is a certain harmony with the thing figured. Would a Salvation Army preacher exhort his audience of derelicts to come and imbibe freely "the gin of salvation"?

Gedaliah enjoined the remnant left behind in the land of Judah by the Babylonian conquerors to go calmly about their customary business,— "Gather ye yayin [used in an anticipative sense] and summer fruits and oil" (Jer. 40.10).

In the hour of Zion's affliction the starving children "say to their mothers, Where is grain

and yayin?" (Lam. 2.12). It is noteworthy in this passage that even young children were accustomed to wine.

Ezekiel speaks of the handiwork of Tyre as consisting "of all kinds of riches, with the yayin of Helbon, and white wool" (Ezek. 27.18).

Daniel, while mourning, "ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor yayin into my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all" (Dan. 10.3).

Hosea entreats Israel to return to Jehovah; for "they that dwell under his shadow shall return; they shall revive as the grain, and blossom as the vine: the scent thereof shall be as the yayin of Lebanon" (Hos. 14.7). God thus pronounced the smell of this alcoholic beverage "very good".

Amos associates fine houses, vineyards, and yayin as blessings that God will strip his people of for their sin (Amos 5.11). But in the final restoration, he foretells, "My people . . . shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the yayin thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them" (Amos 9.14).

Haggai asked the priests this question, "If one bear holy flesh in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread, or pottage, or yayin, or oil, or any food, shall it become holy (Hag. 2.12)?" Haggai here includes wine among the foods. In fact, wherever wine is mentioned in such associations, it is evidently regarded as equally lawful with the rest.

Just a few more miscellaneous references. Job, that "perfect and upright man, that feared God

and turned away from evil", seems to have brought up his family to drink yayin: "And it fell on a day when his sons and his daughters were eating, and drinking yayin, in their eldest brother's house" (Job 1.13). Notice, it was not a black sheep of the family, but all his sons and daughters that were making merry over their wine. Job must have approved it, and indeed have set the example.

In recounting Jehovah's care over all his works the poet who composed one of the most beautiful of all the psalms, No. 104, thus sings:

He bringeth forth grass for the cattle,
And green herb for the service of men;
That he may bring forth food out of the earth,
And yayin that maketh glad the heart of man,
And oil to make him a cheerful countenance,
And bread to strengthen man's heart.
—(Prayer Book Version.)

Yayin, fermented wine, is here in good company; God is its maker and giver.

And here is the feast that Wisdom (Pro. 9.2,5) has prepared and invites us to:

She hath killed her beasts; she hath mingled her yayin;
* * * * * * *
Come, eat ye of my bread,
And drink of the yayin which I have mingled.

It is true that Chapter 4, Verse 17, speaks of the "bread of wickedness" and "the yayin of violence". But there it is "the wicked" who so

pervert both bread and wine. Now, if the wicked can use them for evil, Wisdom can for good.

Enough passages have been cited to oblige us to believe that yayin, fully fermented wine, having a considerable alcoholic content, and causing intoxication if drunk too freely, is looked on by the Old Testament Scriptures as a good gift of God. And this is true also of the alcoholic beverage, or beverages, known as "strong drink". Wine and "strong drink" had then the seal of God's favor on them, however it be now.

The contention that the Old Testament knows two sorts of wine, one, yayin, alcoholic, and condemned, and the other, tirosh, unfermented grape juice, and approved, cannot, therefore, be maintained. And that, without regard to the meaning of tirosh. Granted that tirosh is always the fresh juice of the grape (we shall come to that presently), and that therefore the Old Testament knows two contrasting sorts of wine, even so it is not true that one is always condemned. It is condemned only at times, and is far oftener praised. Where tirosh is praised once, yayin is praised twice or thrice.

Of the three possible views, then, as to the attitude of the Old Testament to wine, two have been disposed of. The first is, that the sacred writers contradict each other. The second is, that they had in view two kinds of wine, an evil and a good. There is left only the third view,—that the distinction made by them is between, not a good and an evil wine, but between a good and an

evil use of wine. Let us see whether or not this is so.

Though wine and "strong drink" are named nearly two hundred times in the Old Testament, the passages commonly cited and relied on to prove that they are condemned are only half a dozen or so. Let us examine them.

Yayin is a mocker, strong drink a brawler;
And whosoever erreth thereby is not wise.
—Pro. 20.1.

This passage, standing alone, would outlaw wine and "strong drink", as making mockers and brawlers. But "wine is a mocker" must be understood in connection with the other Bible teachings as to wine, not as if it stood alone. "No one interprets the statement, 'Knowledge puffeth up' (1 Cor. 8.1), as the condemnation of a certain kind of knowledge; or the words, 'The tongue is a fire' (James 3.6) as suggesting a distinction of tongues as to substance or structure" (Schaff-Hertzog Encyclopedia, 3d Edition, under "Wine"). Moreover, this very sage, only a few chapters earlier (9.1-6), had compared Wisdom to this same yayin: "Come, . . . drink of the yayin which I have mingled". Now the examination we have just made of the Old Testament shows that wine and "strong drink" were universal beverages of the Hebrews; but none of these passages indicate that this people were habitual drunkards. In connection with national and other festivities it may be that they drank more than was good for them, as Christians

are apt to gluttonise at Christmas; and then, in truth, wine was a mocker and "strong drink" a brawler; just as at Thanksgiving and Christmas turkey proves the undoing of so many Americans. And a certain class drank to excess all the time. But the bulk of the nation, as a rule, was sober; and their wine and "strong drink" was neither mocker nor brawler. In fact, even when Isaiah is excoriating his people, so far from blaming them for drinking at all, he twits them because their transgressions had reduced them to such poverty that their silver was debased and their wine (sobe) adulterated by their merchants with water (Is. 1.22).

That, however, the bulk of the people were habitually sober is self-evident; for a nation of drunkards could not have survived. They could not now: they could not then: they never could. Nature would eliminate them. The individual who is a mocker and brawler through intemperance scores a triumph in merely keeping alive and out of jail. Even this is possible only because there is a healthy, sober society about him that he can sponge on and take advantage of. But a society of such people would be a miracle beyond the Almighty. If a sober nation did not put an end to them, nature would.

Yet it was a true generalization that wine in excess was a mocker, and "strong drink" in excess a brawler. If these strong words were meant to score the sin of intemperance, they appealed to the good sense of their readers. Every one would exclaim, "Yes, that is so". Still, though obvious

when attention was called to it, it was a lesson that people needed to be reminded of. Most practical truth is of this sort. Men know what is right, but they lose sight of it. But the declaration that wine and "strong drink" always, or even generally, made mockers and brawlers could not have been dismissed in two lines. In the few words that the sage thought sufficient for his purpose, he was plainly emphasizing a truth that needed no demonstration: his readers understood it as well as he.

In the second line the Revised Versions give "reel" as an alternative for "err". Dr. Crawford H. Toy, Professor of Hebrew in Harvard, and author of the volume on Proverbs, in the International Critical Commentary, prefers this rendering. "Reel" would be decisive for the "in excess" idea:

Yayin is a mocker, strong drink a brawler;
And whosoever reels thereby is not wise.

This is the general, though not the particular, significance of the Septuagint and the Vulgate versions:

Everyone who is foolish is entangled in such things.—Septuagint.

Whoever is led astray by these things will not be wise.—Vulgate.

The fact that there is a question between "err" and "reel" reduces such presumption as the rigorist interpretation of the passage might otherwise have: it rests on an uncertainty.

The purport of this Proverb, according to Prof. Toy, is "the folly of drinking to excess". This view of it is in harmony with the rest of the Scriptures, with the facts, and with the unbroken consensus of scholarship, as far as scholarship has accepted this particular Hebrew reading. That the sacred writer did not qualify his words is no more to be wondered at than that Jesus did not qualify his words, "All that came before me are thieves and robbers" (Jo. 10.8). Scripture often sets forth one aspect of a truth as if it were all, leaving it to common sense to make the necessary qualifications. Modern writing has more regard for formal accuracy; and this difference must be kept in mind in reading the Bible.

Light is thrown on this passage by another in the same book, three chapters later, as follows:

Be not among yayin-bibbers,
Among gluttonous eaters of flesh:
For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty. —Pro. 23.20-21.

Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions?
Who hath complaining? who hath wounds without cause?
Who hath redness of eyes?

They that tarry long at the yayin;
They that go to seek out mixed wine.

Look not upon the yayin when it is red,
When it sparkleth in the cup,
When it goeth down smoothly:
At the last it biteth like a serpent,
And stingeth like an adder.
—Pro. 23.29-32.

Wine-bibbers are topers.

No extended discussion of these passages is needed. Drunkards and gluttons are condemned; but moderate drinking no more than moderate eating. Accordingly this Old Testament Benjamin Franklin, to his own question, "Who hath redness of eyes" etc., answers,

They that tarry long at the wine;
They that go to seek out mixed wine.

The persons whose example the sage is here warning against are those having "wounds without cause" and "redness of eyes" from drink; that is, intemperate persons.

Likewise, too, the injunction,

Look not thou upon the wine when it is red,
When it sparkleth in the cup,

is absolute enough; but its context shows that it refers only to immoderate indulgence. It has in view the toper who, as soon as he begins to come to from his spree asks,

When shall I awake [recover strength] from my wine?
I will seek it yet again.
—Verse 35, after Prof. Toy.

Now let us look at the oracle of king Lemuel, "which his mother taught him":

It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine;
Nor for princes to say, Where is strong drink?
Lest they drink, and forget the law,
And pervert the justice due to any that is afflicted.

Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish,
And wine unto the bitter in soul:
Let him drink, and forget his poverty,
And remember his misery no more.
—Pro. 31.4-7.

The text of the verse, "It is not for kings" etc., is doubtful. One Greek reading is, "Do everything prudently, drink wine prudently". However, on the principle that the harder reading is the more likely, we will take this whole teaching as it stands. Does it, then, forbid people to drink? We are obliged to say it does not. If it forbids drink to one class, it recommends it to another. If kings are not to drink, those in bodily or mental distress may drink. And the latter outnumber the former immeasurably. How many kings are there in the world? A score or two. How many poor souls "in poverty" and in anguish of spirit? Alas, millions and millions. Hundreds of thousands in a London alone never know aught but "la misère". These are the very ones that today are urged to let drink alone. And it almost shocks us to read this ancient wisdom of king Lemuel, which his mother taught him; which was deemed worthy of a place in the inspired word of God:

Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish,
And wine unto the bitter in soul:
Let him drink, and forget his poverty,
And remember his misery no more.

We must insist, however, that the word "kings", in fairness, be construed to apply, not merely to those called kings, but also, and even more, to all who are charged with great responsibilities over

their fellows. Yet, in turn, we must concede that, if the rigorist, literal, grammatical canon be invoked for one purpose, it can be for others. It is a poor rule that does not work both ways.

Great men and sufferers, however, do not make up society. There remains the great intermediate class, which is much larger than both together. May they drink? It would seem so; though the oracle here is dumb. If king Lemuel had meant to exclude them, he would have said so. His very silence gives consent.

Nor, even for the captains of society, may we push the meaning of the sage to extremes. This oracle may intend no more than that, like priests on duty, they had better practise abstinence when discharging their responsibilities, and that at all times they had better err on the side of restraint than indulgence. Let such men be very, very careful.

There remain only two short sayings of Habbakuk, both in the second chapter. Verse 5 starts out, "Yea, moreover, wine is treacherous". The obvious moral is, "Be careful". Verse 15 declares: "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, to thee that addest thy venom, and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness". This means just what it says, Do not make your neighbor drunk. Here is the rendering of this passage by the Rev. Dr. William Hayes Ward, editor of Habbakuk, in the International Critical Commentary (late editor also of The Independent):

Woe to him that maketh his neighbor drunk from
the cup of thy wrath,
Even making him drunken, so as to look on naked-
ness.

Thus the teachings concerning yayin and "strong drink" gathered from the rest of the Old Testament are not impaired by the five or six just examined. These present only the bad side; for the reason that their sole purpose is to warn against the danger in drink. All the teachings of the Old Testament as to the use of wine and "strong drink", then, harmonize. Their common burden is: Wine and "strong drink" are good gifts of God, not to be decried, not to be misused, but to be enjoyed (if one will) as a portion from him who giveth to all their meat in due season. "Yayin is represented as in daily use, whether at the ordinary family meal and the more ambitious banquet or at the sacrificial feast and in the ritual of the sanctuary." It was real wine, of different ages, of different vintage, "the wine of Lebanon", "the wine of Helbon"; but all alike alcoholic. Later Jewish legislation provided that the new wine should not be admissible for the drink-offering, till it had stood forty days in the fermenting vat.

II

The case of fermented wine in the Old Testament is settled by the usage of the word yayin, which occurs nearly one hundred and fifty times. The repeated and positive approval of this beverage by Jehovah, alike for his own use and for

the use of his people, makes the indiscriminate censure of it (and of like beverages no more dangerous than wine) a censure of God himself. All that is claimed for the word tirosh, namely, that it always stands for unfermented grape-juice and is always approved, might be granted without affecting the attitude of these Scriptures toward yayin. To approve tea is not to condemn coffee. If tirosh is different from yayin, how can the judgment passed on one beverage affect some other beverage, except, it may be, in some point common to both?

Yet the standing of tirosh in the Old Testament will now be investigated, because of the importance that some have attached to this question. The discussion of it may have interest, if not value. What, indeed, if it should even have value?

The word tirosh is in the Old Testament thirty-eight times.

Isaiah has it in chapter 65, verse 8: "Thus saith Jehovah, As the tirosh is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it", etc. According to this, tirosh might be the grape or the natural unaltered juice, whether in or out of the grape.

Micah, 6.15, says, "Thou shalt tread . . . the tirosh, but shalt not drink the yayin". This looks as if tirosh were the grapes: how could juice be trodden? Yet Isaiah speaks of treading yayin, which every one admits to be the juice, and old fermented juice at that: "No treader shall tread out yayin in the presses" (Is. 16.10). "Tread out" here is the same word rendered "tread" in

Micah 6.15: the "out" ought to be left out: Isaiah's expression is "tread yayin in the presses".

So far, then, tirosh is grape juice, whether in the grape, just out of the grape, or some time out of the grape.

Joel 2.24, "The floors shall be full of wheat, and the vats shall overflow with tirosh and oil", is a harvest scene, and the tirosh is what our English versions term "new wine", the juice recently, if not just, expressed, the juice as long as it was in the vats.

So it is in Pro. 3.10:

> So shall thy barns be filled with plenty,
> And thy vats shall overflow with tirosh.

The same thing is inferable from Joel 1.10: "The grain is destroyed, the tirosh is dried up, the oil languisheth".

That tirosh is new, as opposed to old, wine is indicated by Deut. 18.4, "The first fruits of thy grain, of thy tirosh, and of thine oil, and the first of the fleece of thy sheep, shalt thou give him" [the priest]: tirosh belongs with the first-fruits.

So tirosh comes under the law of tithes (possibly tithes and first-fruits were the same): "Thou shalt surely tithe all the increase of thy seed, that which cometh forth from the field, year by year. And thou shalt eat . . . the tithe of thy grain, of thy tirosh, and of thine oil, and the firstlings of thy herd" (Deut. 14.22-23).

Tirosh is also in habitual association with grain

(or corn) and with oil. "God give thee . . . plenty of grain and tirosh" (Gen. 27.28) and "A nation that . . . shall not leave thee grain, tirosh, or oil" (Deut. 28.51) are two instances of many.

These products of the field, likewise, are fresh, as Hosea indicates by the expression "in the time thereof", in 2.9: "Therefore will I take back my grain in the time thereof, and my tirosh in the season thereof, and will pluck away my wool and my flax". Note the raw products "wool and flax", not garments of wool, not linen. As tirosh belongs with grain, so does yayin with flour: "Thou shalt offer . . . a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour . . . and the fourth part of a hin of yayin" (Ex. 29.38,40). It is always bread and yayin, grain and tirosh: "Melchizedek . . . brought forth bread and yayin" (Gen. 14.18). Grain ceases to be grain when "made up", and becomes flour or bread. Flax ceases to be flax, when "made up", and becomes linen. Tirosh ceases to be tirosh, when "made up", and becomes yayin. To use a modern term, yayin is the manufactured article, the finished product; tirosh is the article as raw material or in process.

The passages so far indicate that tirosh is the juice of the grape till it becomes yayin, from its expression from the fruit till it is recognized as a finished product. But, if this is so, tirosh must include all the stages of fermentation, with their rackings, till the wine is recognized as made, finished. In that hot country bubbles begin to rise in the fresh juice within an hour, and next day

fermentation is in full swing, with a considerable and growing alcoholic content. It may have been forty or fifty days before the fermentation was considered complete (it continued, in fact, very much longer, but in the more delicate and refined changes of wine), and during these weeks the article was tirosh. After the first few days men could intoxicate themselves on it about as easily as they ever could. And yet it was tirosh, not yayin.

There must, too, have been a short time when the product could be termed indifferently either tirosh or yayin, that is, when it could be considered old tirosh or new yayin.

But are there any other passages or facts in point?

There is the fact that, though tirosh was never offered in the sacrifice, it was subject to the law of tithes: "Thou shalt eat . . . the tithe of thy grain, and of thy tirosh" (Deut. 14.23). This must be done "before Jehovah thy God, in the place which he shall choose" (14.23); that is, at Jerusalem. They must carry their tithes thither, if it was not too far. Now, before the wine-maker could determine what his tithe was, he would have to wait till all his grapes were pressed. Give him some time to prepare for the journey and to accomplish it, ten to fifty miles, or more; consider the constant agitation of the juice during the journey; and I am afraid his tirosh must have had a pretty keen bite. The later view of the school is clear from their ruling that tirosh is tithable from the moment it throws up scum.

Isaiah, 62.8-9, by itself is decisive: "Jehovah hath sworn . . . foreigners shall not drink thy tirosh, for which those hast labored; . . . they that have gathered it shall drink it in the courts of my sanctuary". This could not be unfermented grape-juice.

And, lastly, there is Hosea 4.11, which would be ample, even if it were all: "Whoredom and yayin and tirosh take away the understanding",—fornication and drunkenness. Now unfermented grape-juice never took away anybody's understanding. But here tirosh does just what yayin does. Prof. Harper, in the International Critical Commentary, says that these words were a proverb; which, for our inquiry, gives them all the more significance,—the intoxicating power of tirosh was a proverb.

Thus all the praises bestowed on tirosh are bestowed on a drink that, in one of its stages, could "take away the understanding", could make drunk. Tirosh, too, like yayin, had to be guarded against.

Unexpectedly, then, tirosh confirms the conclusions drawn from yayin. The Old Testament leaves both to the good judgment of men. Drink yayin, tirosh, and "strong drink", if you wish, but stop before they harm you. The wrong is in the hurt.

In later Hebrew the word yayin is extended to include both the freshly expressed grape-juice, or must, and the fermented juice of various other fruits, such as the apple-wine frequently mentioned in the Mischna. The word tirosh had be-

come obsolete by the Mischna, and yayin may be used for it.

Tirosh and Yayin.—The distinction between these two terms is strikingly brought out in Deut. 14.23-26, a passage already cited in connection with each word separately. This passage prescribes that the tithe of tirosh and other first-fruits shall be carried by the farmer to Jerusalem and consumed there. But, if on account of the distance this would be a hardship, then he may sell them and carry the money to Jerusalem, there to buy and eat their equivalents. But among these equivalents yayin is named instead of tirosh. Why? Probably because tirosh was not a staple commodity of trade, and yayin was. The farmer could not be sure of finding fresh wine, tirosh, to buy, even "in the season thereof"; but he could be sure of finding yayin, the matured wine, at all seasons. And Jehovah evidently regarded the two as morally equivalent, tirosh and yayin.

III

Besides those passages in the Old Testament in which wine or "strong drink" is named directly, there are others in which drink is spoken of under some other term;—as, for example, the word cup. These passages, too, are significant for our present investigation. One must suffice, the 5th verse of the 23d Psalm: *My cup runneth over.* What was this cup running over with? The ancient Versions do not render this clause as the modern do: they make it refer to the quality, not the quan-

tity, of the beverage. The Septuagint translates it, *the cup that intoxicates;* the Vulgate, the same,—*calix meus inebrians,* my inebriating cup. The International Critical Commentary here agrees with the Ancient Versions, rendering it, *My cup is exhilarating;* that is, "the cup given to me by my host, the wine cup of welcome",—a cup "whose wine saturates, drenches, or soaks the one who drinks it, so excellent its quality and so ample its quantity, intoxicating; so St. Augustine, explaining *inebrians,* 'And thy cup yielding forgetfulness of former vain delights' ". *"Inebrians, irrigans, laetificans, consolatione plenus, exuberans, redundans excellentissimo liquore" is the explanation of Genebradus.*

"This cup", then, of the beautiful 23d Psalm "runneth over" with fermented wine.

CHAPTER II

OUTSIDE AUTHORITIES

I

The Septuagint and Apocrypha.—After the Babylonian Captivity, the Hebrew language, in which the Old Testament was written, gradually fell into disuse, until, finally, it was preserved only as a learned and sacred language. It was superseded by the Aramaic, an allied tongue; and this, not Hebrew, was the language that Jesus spoke. In time, even the Holy Scriptures were so ill understood in Hebrew that, as they were read in the synagogue services, they were translated, or paraphrased, into the vernacular, verse by verse, or section by section.

But there was a great, or greater, Jewry growing up outside the Holy Land, "the dispersion"; for then, when the Jews had a country, they wandered and settled as widely as today, when they have none. These foreign Jews, among the "nations", were as little familiar with Aramaic as with Hebrew. They spoke the language of their adopted country, and, in addition, in common with the educated classes everywhere, Greek.

It became a necessity, therefore, that the Scriptures should be translated into Greek, and this was done by learned Jews of Alexandria;—first the Law, and little by little the rest, one after another, as the need was felt,—the whole task ex-

tending over a very long period. This Greek translation is known as the Septuagint, commonly abbreviated LXX. It came into familiar use, like our King James Version, and was even employed in the worship of the Grecian synagogues. It is this version, not the Hebrew, that is quoted from in the New Testament.

But the LXX. contains some dozen to fifteen books not found in the Hebrew canon, though many, or most, of these are from Hebrew or Aramaic originals. These additional books are known as the Apocrypha. They were received as canonical Scripture by all Christendom till the Reformation; and since the Reformation the Lutherans and Episcopalians accord them a position just inferior to the Scriptures proper. Other Protestants reject them.

The Apocryphal books belong in the interval of several centuries between the Old Testament and the New. They are universally admitted to be of great value for the light they throw on Jewish life and thought in this interval.

Throughout the Septuagint the various Hebrew words for wine are almost uniformly rendered by oinos, the ordinary Greek word for the fermented beverage. This shows that in the judgment of these learned Jews of Alexandria virtually all the wines of the Old Testament, whether old or new, were alcoholic. There is no mistaking the nature of this oinos: read the following,—

Wine and women will make men of understanding to fall away.—Jesus ben Sirach, 19.2.

Even an ancient would not have been ungallant enough to classify women with unfermented grape juice. Besides, what man of understanding, or without understanding, was ever seduced to his fall by unfermented grape juice?

This passage exhibits the general attitude of the Apocrypha to drink. Wine may intoxicate; women, ensnare. Must men have nothing to do with women, then? No more are they obliged to hold aloof from wine. They must be careful in their relations with women: they must be careful in their use of wine. In both directions, discretion is the need.

Wine and women are brought together again in 9.9 of the same book:

> Sit not at all with a woman that hath a husband,
> And revel not with her at the wine.

Good advice for any man: merry-making with another's man's wife is risky.

A passage in this same Jesus ben Sirach, 31.25-30, shows that this wine was alcoholic, and that these ancient Jews,—and the presumption is their ancestors,—thought it a lawful indulgence; to be kept, however, under control:

> Show not thyself valiant in wine;
> For wine hath destroyed many.
> The furnace proveth the temper of steel by dipping;
> So doth wine prove hearts in the quarreling of the proud.
> Wine is as good as life to men,
> If thou drink it in its measure:

What life is there to a man that is without wine?
And it hath been created to make men glad.
Wine drunk in season and to satisfy
Is joy of heart, and gladness of soul:
Wine drunk largely is bitterness of soul,
With provocation and conflict.
Drunkenness increaseth the rage of a fool unto his hurt;
It diminisheth strength and addeth wounds.

Wine-drinking was probably no commoner in this period than it had been in the great days of Israel: in both periods it was universal. But the later and more refined age had developed it into an art. In the Apocrypha, for the first time, we hear of "banquets of wine". These the Jews may have learned from the Greeks, who had their "symposiums", or drinking parties. Or they may have been the kind of feast spoken of in Isaiah 24.7-9, under another name. In either case, the pious Jew who wrote this book in Aramaic, about the year 200 B. C., found nothing to object to in such feasts, if kept within bounds. Of these "banquets of wine" music seems to have been an inseparable element. Here is the way Ben Sirach speaks of them:

As a signet of carbuncle in a setting of gold,
So is a concert of music in a banquet of wine.
As a signet of emerald in a work of gold,
So is a strain of music with pleasant wine.
—Jesus ben Sirach, 32.5-6.

The music and the wine alike are good, and each is better for the other.

These are good; but there is something still better:

Wine and music rejoice the heart;
And the love of wisdom is above both.
—Jesus ben Sirach, 40.20.

Yet this ancient café chantant was very pleasant; the poet comes back to it:

The memorial of Josiah is like the composition of incense
Prepared by the work of the apothecary:
It shall be sweet as honey in every mouth,
And as music at a banquet of wine.
—Jesus ben Sirach, 49.1.

All this praise of alcoholic wine is not written merely because the subject appealed to the writer; but (as we learn from his preface) the author was moved "to write somewhat pertaining to instruction and wisdom; in order that those who love learning, and are addicted to these things, might make progress much more by living according to the law" (Prologue to Jesus ben Sirach). And the author's grandson who translated the book into Greek did it "for them also who in the land of their sojourning are desirous to learn, fashioning their manners beforehand, so as to live according to the law" (Prologue). The banquet of wine, then, is "according to [that is, in accordance with] the law" of God.

This review shows us that the principle governing drink is the same in the long interim between the Old Testament and Christ as it had been throughout the Old Testament. But there were one or two differences of detail worth noting. One is in the same book, Jesus ben Sirach, 9.10:

Forsake not an old friend;
For the new is not comparable to him:
As new wine, so is a new friend;
If it become old, thou shalt drink it with gladness.

This is the view taken by the Jews of Jesus' day, as we learn from his words (Luke 5.39): "No man having drunk old wine desireth new; for he saith, 'The old is good [better]' ".

A change had taken place in the national taste. The tirosh, the new wine, the fresh wine, fermenting, but not "ripe", of the old days, the occasion of so much simple harvest joy, no longer appealed to the taste; or at least not to the taste of those who set the mode. In the first place, a refined taste would prefer the more delicate flavor of the matured product. The cultivated Jew probably looked on tirosh as a plebeian drink, raw, unfinished, harsh, good enough for country folk and the lower classes. For himself, he politely excused himself, if he ever came across it, with the remark, "The old is better". In the second place, the rough fermenting wine, being more plentiful, also cheaper, would be drunk, if at all, much more freely; and the Jews, being now largely an urban people, could not stand so much stimulant as their rude farmer ancestors, when "Judah and Israel dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his fig tree, from Dan even to Beersheba" (1 Kings 4.25). Tirosh in its earliest stages may, on the other hand, have been as hard for city people to get as pure cider is now.

The passage from country to city life explains

another change, which may in the first place have been borrowed from the Greeks; that is, the custom of diluting the wine with water, as is commonly done in France now. In the early days "wine mixed with water" was either an adulteration or a sign of poverty (Is. 1.22). But in the Hellenistic period "neat" wine was too strong. They diluted it usually three parts of water to one of wine; which, curiously, is the proportion recommended by Hesiod, in "Works and Days", for peasants in the dog-days (line 596. The passage, however, is interpolated). Jesus, no doubt, did this at the Passover Supper. The water was usually warm.

The passage of the Apocrypha which proves this diluting shows that, if the Jew was then averse to wine undiluted, he was no less averse to water unfortified. Nobody drank wine without water; yet nobody who could help it drank water without wine. The passage is that which closes the Apocrypha in our English arrangement, 2 Maccabees, 15.38-39. After stating that his purpose was, not only to tell the story of the Maccabees, but to tell it well, the writer gives this illustration: "For, as it is distasteful to drink wine alone, and in like manner again to drink water alone, while the mingling of wine with water at once giveth full pleasantness to the flavor; so also the fashioning of the language delighteth the ears of them that read the story".

The glorious heroism of the Maccabees had not been nourished on plain water.

The Jews of the Apocrypha thought that in their praise and their use of fermented wine they were

following the ways of their ancestors, and "living according to the law" (Preface to Jesus ben Sirach). We can hardly deny that those Jews were as well qualified to understand their Scriptures on this point as we are. To their scholars the ancient Hebrew had never ceased to be a familiar tongue. And, if there had been an apostasy from the law and the prophets in this matter, such a revolution could not have been effected without one recorded protest. Yet there is not even the trace of one. We must conclude that there was no protest. The earlier Jews and the later Jews were at one in their approval and use of wine, as well as in their condemnation of excess.

II

Philo.—Philo was the greatest of the Hellenised Jews, that is, of Jews who brought Greek culture and philosophy into the service of the Law and the Prophets. He was entering on his distinguished career when Jesus was born. His life was spent in Alexandria, the intellectual center of the world. He wrote voluminously, and a good part of what he wrote has survived, either in the Greek or in translations. As his writings had to do with the history and religion of the Jewish people, we should expect to find some indications in them of the distinction between forbidden and permitted wines, if there was such a distinction.

First, it is noteworthy that the word used by Philo for wine is oinos, the ordinary Greek word for the fermented product. It is oinos, says Philo,

that the priests are to abstain from during the time of their ministration in public worship. It was oinos, too, he says, that God commanded the people to give the priests among their first-fruits, "a portion of wine out of each wine-press", "first-fruits of corn and oinos and oil". That is, what the priests were to abstain from on certain occasions (because of the danger of intoxication) was the very thing that God ordered to be given them in return for their services on those occasions. The fermented wine that they were to abstain from occasionally they were to use habitually. The use of the one word, oinos, in both connections, shows that in Philo's view the Scriptures made a distinction between a forbidden and a permitted use, but not between a forbidden and a permitted kind, of wine. It was not one sort of wine that was forbidden, while another sort was permitted. It was the same wine in each case.

This is, further, confirmed by what Philo writes concerning the intoxication of Noah. He tries to show that Noah was not drunken, by giving to the word "drunken" a fanciful meaning. This is, of course, absurd; but a statement that he makes in supporting this dictum is conclusive as to his view of the Scriptural teaching concerning wine. He asks the question, "What is the meaning of the statement, 'He drank of the wine and was drunken'?" And then he gives this answer: "In the first place, the just man did not drink the wine, but a portion of the wine, not the whole of it ['he drank *of* the wine']; in which case an incontinent and debauched man does not quit his means of

debauchery till he has first swallowed all the wine that there is before him; but by the religious and sober man everything necessary for food is used in a moderate degree. And the expression, 'He was drunken', is here to be taken simply as equivalent to 'he used the wine'. But there are two modes of 'getting drunk'. The one is that of an intemperate sottishness which misuses wine, and this offence is peculiar to the depraved and wicked man. The other is the use of wine, and this belongs to the wise. It is therefore in the second of these meanings that the consistent and wise Noah is here called 'drunken', not as having misused but as having used wine" (Questions and Answers 68). The distinction that Philo makes, and which he thinks the Hebrew Scriptures make, is not, therefore, between two wines, one good and the other evil, but between use and misuse of the one wine.

He has a good deal more to say about wine throughout his works; one of which is on "The Planting of Noah"; another, on "Drunkenness"; another, on "Sobriety". The very subjects made it imperative that the distinction between two wines, one unfermented and good, and the other fermented and evil, should be drawn out, repeated, emphasized, dwelt on. But there is not a word of the sort in all that he wrote, not one word. Could a Two-Wine Advocate today, writing on "Drunkenness" and on "Sobriety", manage to avoid even an allusion to this vital distinction? Yet Philo did. The only practices in connection with wine that he censures are drunkenness and

the use of unmixed wine as leading to drunkenness: the Jews had long ago adopted the Greek custom of diluting their wine with water.

Here follow some extracts from Philo that are both curious and significant. Wherever in these the word wine is used, it stands for the Greek oinos. Now Philo makes it as clear as day, first, that this oinos may intoxicate; and, second, that it is right to drink it.

"The Planting of Noah".—

XXXVI. . . . "At all events, it is plain that unmixed wine is a poison, which is the cause, if not of death, at least of madness. . . . Since wine [oinos] is the cause of madness and folly to those who indulge in it insatiably". Notice the "insatiably".

XXXVIII.—"The ancients called unmixed wine oinos and also methy. . . . Both these words [namely, as verbal forms] intimate a taking of too much wine [note the "too much"], . . . and if he be overcome with wine, he will also be drunk".

XXXIX. . . . "The men of the present day do not drink wine as the ancients did. For now they drink eagerly, without once taking breath, till the body and soul are both wholly relaxed, and they keep on bidding their cup-bearers bring more wine, and are angry with them if they delay, while they are cooling what is by them called the hot drink; and, in a vile imitation of gymnastic contests, they institute a contest among their fellow-revellers as to who can drink most wine, in which they do many glorious things to one another's

ears and noses, and the tips of the fingers of their hands, and any other parts of the body they can get at. . . . But the men of old time began every good action with perfect sacrifices, thinking that in that way the result would be most favorable to them. . . . Knowing, therefore, that the use and enjoyment of wine require much care, they did not drink unmixed wine in great quantities or at all times, but only in moderation and on fitting occasions. For, first of all, they offered up prayers and instituted sacrifices. . . . After sacrificing, it was the custom of the men of old to drink great quantities of wine. . . .

"And to whom could the manner of using unmixed wine, described above, be more appropriate than to wise men, to whom the work to be done before drinking, namely, sacrificing, is so appropriate?"

XLI. . . . "Unmixed wine seems to increase and render more intense all the natural qualities, whether they be good or the contrary. . . . Unmixed wine, being poured forth in abundance, makes the man who is the slave of his passions still more subservient to them; but it renders him who has them under control more manageable and amiable."

"On Drunkenness".—

I. . . . "In many places of his history of the giving of the law he [Moses] mentions wine, . . . and he commands some persons to drink it, but some he does not permit to do so; and at times he gives contrary directions to the same people, ordering them sometimes to drink and

sometimes to abstain. These, therefore, are the persons who have taken the great vow, to whom it is expressly forbidden to drink unmixed wine, being the priests who are engaged in offering sacrifices. But those who drink wine are numerous beyond all calculation, and among them are all those who are especially praised by the law given for their virtue."

XXXIII. . . . "Yet is not any one when about to become the minister of the Ruler and Father of the universe to show himself superior to meat and drink and sleep and all the vulgar necessities of nature, but [not] to turn aside to luxury and effeminacy, and imitate the life of the intemperate? And having his eyes weighed down with wine, and his head shaking, and bending his neck on one side, and belching forth intemperance, and being weak and tottering in his whole body is he in that condition to approach the sacred purifications and altars and sacrifices? No: such a one may not without impiety even behold the sacred flame at a distance."

"On Sobriety".—

I. . . . "Sobriety is most advantageous to those bodies to which the drinking of wine is naturally suitable."

De Somniis, 2.38.—"The Logos [or Reason, the term used later by St. John of Christ] is the master of the spiritual drinking-feast."

"Legum Allegoriarum", 3.26.—"But Melchizedek [the Logos, or Reason] shall bring forward wine instead of water, and shall give your souls to drink, and shall cheer them with unmixed wine,

in order that they may be wholly occupied with a divine intoxication, more sober than sobriety itself'' [Evidently the physical wine could intoxicate].

III

Josephus.—Josephus was a famous Jewish historian, a partisan of Rome, who lived in the generation following Christ.

It will, however, be convenient to examine his witness at this point, before proceeding to the New Testament.

His great work is ''The Antiquities'', a history of the Jewish people from the creation of the world to the outbreak of the late war with Rome, a war in which he had a considerable part. In this history he follows the Scriptures in the portions covered by them; and occasionally alludes to wine. The word he uses (in his Greek translation of his work) is oinos. What sort of beverage oinos was, in his judgment, is clear from his citation of King Darius's question, Which is the strongest,—wine, women, or truth? ''Wine, O king, deceives the mind of those that drink it. . . . It quenches the sorrow of those that are under calamities, and makes men forget the debts they owe to others. . . . When they are become sober, and they have slept out their wine in the night, they arise without knowing anything they have done in their cups'' (Antiq. Book 11, chapter 3). Clearly this oinos, wine, was not unfermented grape-juice. The controversialist would be rash indeed who set out to prove that unfermented

grape-juice was stronger, that is, more seductive, than women and truth. The world would, indeed, be in evil case, were unfermented grape-juice its mightiest charm.

Josephus mentions, too, this same oinos, wine, as forbidden to the priests during their ministration: "Nor are they permitted to drink wine so long as they wear those [sacerdotal] garments" (Antiq. Book 3, chapter 12). This is equivalent to their abstinence from wine while they ministered in the temple, because only then they wore those sacred garments, which were laid up there from one time of ministration to another. He mentions it also as forbidden to the Nazirites: "They suffer their hair to grow long, and they use no wine" (Antiq. Book 4, chapter 4). It is the same oinos, so far as appears, that he says was ordered to be offered to God in sacrifice: "They bring the same quantity of oil which they do of wine, and they pour the wine about the altar" (Antiq. Book 3, chapter 9). And presumably it is this very same beverage, oinos, that Josephus associates with grain and oil as provisions: "The first [man] thou wilt see carrying three loaves of bread; the second carrying a kid of the goats; and the third will follow them carrying a bottle of wine" [Antiq. Book 6, chapter 4]; "With great plenty of corn and wine and slain beasts" [Antiq. Book 8, chapter 15]; "20,000 measures of wheat, and as many bottles of oil, . . . the same measure of wine" [Antiq. Book 8, chapter 2]; "wine, and oil, . . . fine flour,

. . . salt" [Antiq. Book 12, chapter 3]. It was likewise this same "oinos", wine, with which Noah was "drunken" [Antiq. Book 1, chapter 6]; and also the Amalekite foe surprised by David [Antiq. Book 6, chapter 14].

That Josephus believed the oinos, wine, of which he has been speaking, to be different from fresh grape-juice is evident from a passage in which he speaks of the latter. It is where he is paraphrasing Joseph's interpretation of the dream of the chief butler, Genesis 40. The butler relates (verse 11) how, in his dream, "Pharaoh's cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes and pressed them into Pharaoh's cup" (Antiq. 2, 5). Josephus paraphrases the passage thus: "He said therefore that in his sleep he saw three clusters of grapes . . . and that he squeezed them into a cup, and when he had strained the gleukos he gave it to the king to drink". The word for this fresh grape-juice is not oinos, but gleukos; which is the usual Greek word for this product.

Nowhere does Josephus intimate that there was a bad and forbidden oinos, wine; though he surely knew that the oinos, wine, used in the sacrifice was yayin, fermented and alcoholic. There is nothing in Josephus to suggest that any wine was evil; or that any kind of wine was evil. His association of it with oil and meal shows that to him wine was a food or refreshment. Without question, too, Josephus assumed that in his view of wine he was in accord with the Scriptures.

IV

Rabbinical Literature.—Rabbinical literature is the literature of the oldest Jewish philosophy and theology. It is, in fact or form, a commentary on the Hebrew Scriptures. As such, it has many things to say of wine, and all that it says on this subject confirms what we have learned from the Old Testament and the Apocrypha: wine is always a good gift of God, which may be abused.

The following interesting citations are from the Jewish Encyclopedia, under Wine.

"In Aboth, 4.26, the man that learns from a young and immature teacher is compared to one 'that eats unripe grapes and drinks wine from the vat' ". This shows how little unfermented grape-juice was thought of.

"The wines of Syria were not considered drinkable under two to four months".

New wine is defined as wine of the last vintage: it might thus be nearly a year old. Old wine was of the vintage last but one; that is, up to two years old. Very old wine was of the vintage before that. The Jews had no old wine, as we should consider it; that is, wine of several or many years. They had difficulty in keeping it even three years. Their methods was so crude that the wine soon set up acetous fermentation. As for the art of preserving unfermented grape-juice, there is not a suggestion, in the Bible or out of the Bible, that the Jews ever heard of it.

Drinking places are frequently spoken of, under the name of beth-ha-yayin, house of wine. Indeed, the Song of Songs speaks of one in 2.4:

He brought me to the house of wine,
And his banner over me was love.

This Rabbinical literature is fond of building up moral lessons on what are often no better than puns. Thus, there are two Hebrew words, Rosh, meaning the head, and Rash, meaning poor; which looked the same, since in this Hebrew the vowels were not written. This offered a fine opening for a warning against the dangers of ti-rosh. Accordingly, it is explained that wine is called tirosh because one who drinks it habitually is certain to become Rash, poor. Rabbi Kahana said that tirosh, drunk in moderation, gives Rosh, that is, headship, or leadership; if drunk to excess, it brings to Rash, that is, poverty. Again: "If thou abuse tirosh, thou shall be Rash; if thou rightly use it, thou shall be Rosh" (Yoma 76.2).

The Targumists, Onkelos and Jonathan, render tirosh in every instance (the word having become obsolete) by chamar, undeniably an alcoholic beverage.

A Jewish sage says, "Wine is the greatest of all medicines; where wine is lacking, there drugs are necessary". R. Huna, "Wine helps to open the heart to reasoning". R. Papa thought that, when one could substitute beer for wine, it should be done for the sake of economy. But his view was opposed on the ground that the preservation of the health is paramount to consideration of economy. "Very old wine benefits the whole body" (Pes. 426). Rabbi was cured of a severe disorder

of the bowels by drinking apple-wine 70 years old, which had been preserved by a Gentile.

"The good things of Egypt", which Joseph sent to his father, are supposed by R. Eleazar to have included "old wine", which satisfies the elderly person,—old wine for an old person. Until the age of 40, liberal eating is beneficial; but after 40 it is better to drink more and eat less (Shab. 152a). R. Papa said that wine is more nourishing when taken in large mouthfuls. Wine gives an appetite, cheers the body, and satisfies the stomach (Ber. 35b). After bleeding, according to R. Samuel, wine should be taken freely, in order that the red of the wine may replace the red of the blood which has been lost (Shab. 129a).

No other beverage in religious ceremonies is known in the Rabbinical literature. Over all fruit the benediction used is that for the fruits of the tree; but over wine a special benediction for the fruits of the vine is pronounced (Ber. 6.1). One sage was of the opinion that beer might be used, religiously, in place of wine in countries where that is the natural beverage.

Following Prov. 31.6,—"Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto the bitter in soul",—the Rabbins ordered ten cups of wine to be served with "the meal of consolation", at the mourner's house; three cups before the meal, three cups between courses, four cups after grace! Later four more cups were add; but, as these were found to produce drunkenness, they were discontinued.

Throughout the vast and rambling commentary

and exegesis that make up this Jewish literature, the only wine in ordinary use is the wine that in excess leads to drunkenness. This wine is everywhere regarded as among God's choicest blessings. The reasoning of the sages is at times fantastic; but their meaning is clear:—wine is good, —do not misuse it. Nowhere is unfermented grape-juice recommended as a substitute. It is named, in general, only to be slurred.

But here a distinction must be borne in mind. For ritual purposes, grape-juice forty days old or more was considered fermented; under forty days, unfermented. Thus the commentary of the Talmud (Krithoth 13.B) upon Leviticus 10.9,—forbidding priests to drink, while on duty,—is as follows:—

1.—"If the priest had partaken of the juice of grapes which was less than forty days old, then God would not destroy him".

2.—The Talmud (Baba Bathra 97 A) states that the wine used for the Kiddush service on the Sabbath and Holy Days must be at least forty days old. However, if such is not to be had, a juice of younger age may be used.—Rabbi B. Hailperin.

Clearly, this juice "of younger age", which had been in ferment less than forty days, was, in general, a strongly alcoholic beverage. It might be really unfermented, but the chance of its being so in any instance was small; say, thirty-nine to one against it.

Note.—At this point it is convenient to explain that the "Vulgate", which I cite frequently as a witness to the nature of Bible wines, is the Latin

translation of the Bible, out of the original languages, made by St. Jerome, toward the end of the 4th Century. This Vulgate, "vulgar", or "vernacular", was the authorized translation in Western Christendom for over a thousand years, and is so still in the Roman Catholic Church.

V

The Jewish Encyclopedia, on "Wine".—"There were different kinds of wine. 'Yayin' was the ordinary matured fermented wine; 'tirosh' was a new wine; and 'shekar' was an old powerful wine ('strong drink'). The red wine was the better and stronger (Ps. 75.9 [A. V. 8]; Prov. 23.31). Perhaps the wines of Helbon (Ezek. 27.18) and the wine of Lebanon (Hos. 14.7) were white wines. . . . In metaphorical usage, in Rabbinical literature, wine represents the essence of goodness. The Tora, Jerusalem, Israel, the Messiah, the righteous are all compared to wine. The wicked are likened unto vinegar, and the good man who turns to wickedness is compared to sour wine."

Hastings' Bible Dictionary, II. 33b, says of *tirosh:* "It is said to take away the understanding, in Hosea 4.11, and its intoxicating qualities are referred to by the Talmudists".

The Encyclopedia Biblica, summing up the Old Testament witness on Wine, says:—

"Occurring over 140 times in the traditional text of the Old Testament, *yayin* denotes, like its Greek and Latin congeners, *oinos* and *vinum,* the juice of the grape, fermented and matured in ap-

propriate vessels. It is represented as in daily use, whether at the ordinary family meal and the more ambitious banquet, or at the sacrificial feast and in the ritual of the sanctuary. *Yayin* is uniformly rendered by *wine* in the English Version, by *oinos* in the Septuagint (except Job 32.19, where the sense is correctly given by *gleukos,* sweet fermenting must), and by *vinum* in the Latin. In Old Testament *yayin* is confined to grape wine. . . . By analogy we ought to regard *tirosh* as primarily the freshly expressed and still unfermented grape-juice. . . . On the other hand, it is important, in view of the controversies to which the term *tirosh* has given rise, to note that in certain passages it clearly denotes *the product of fermentation,* or wine properly so called. Its application, in this respect, however, was apparently limited to 'new wine', as frequently rendered in Authorized and Revised Versions, either while still in the fermenting stage or during the next few months, while the process of maturing was still incomplete.'' The second reason for this view given by the encyclopedia is: ''*Tirosh* is repeatedly mentioned as subject to the law of tithes and of the first-fruits (Deut. 12.17, 14.23, 18.4; Neh. 10.37 and elsewhere). Now the later Jewish code specifies the precise moment when the expressed grape-juice becomes subject to the law of tithe: 'Must is tithable from the moment it throws up scum'. . . . Even the inferior wine made by pouring water on the refuse of the press had to ferment before becoming subject to tithe. . . . Hence, when it is said

that tirosh shall be drunk in the courts of the sanctuary (Is. 62.8 f), the conclusion is unavoidable that tirosh is not here the unfermented must, but true fermented wine".

The third reason for this view of the meaning of tirosh is "the evidence of the Versions". With two exceptions the Septuagint has uniformly rendered tirosh by *oinos;* while Jerome, with very few exceptions, renders by *vinum,* not as we might expect, by *mustum.*

"With regard to the attitude of the Old Testament and New Testament to the general question of the use of fermented beverages, it is worthy of note that, while tirosh, in the Old Testament, sometimes denotes the unfermented must, there is no trace in Hebrew literature, from the earliest period to the close of the Mishna, of any method of preserving it in the unfermented state. Indeed, it has been maintained that 'with the total absence of antiseptic precautions characteristic of Orientals, it would have been impossible to do so' (Prof. Macalister, in Hastings' Bible Dictionary 2.34 b, in this agreeing with many modern authorities). Throughout the Old Testament the use of wine as a daily beverage appears as an all but universal custom. Even its use to the extent of exhilaration is implicitly approved (Gen. 43.34; Judg. 9.13; Ps. 104.15; Pro. 31.7), whilst the value of alcohol as a stimulant in sickness and distress is explicitly recognized (Pro. 31.6; 1 Tim. 5.23).

The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia, on Wine:—

"The usual designation for fermented grape-

juice is *yayin,* corresponding to Greek *oinos* and Latin *vinum.* Tirosh is used to denote the newly extracted grape-juice, and also the juice yet contained in the cluster. There is, however, no special emphasis herein upon the distinction 'not yet fermented', since in the Orient fermentation begins very quickly after the pressing, and even the *tirosh* is accredited with intoxicating effects (Hos. 4.11; Deut. 12.17; 18.4).

CHAPTER III

THE GOSPELS

I

If the books of the New Testament were arranged in the order in which they were written, the Gospels would come last, not first: some scholars, indeed, think that the book which now stands last, the Revelation, was written first. However, as far as the language is concerned, it is all sufficiently of a piece, certainly so in the matter of vocabulary.

Wine is frequently mentioned in the New Testament, and "strong drink" once. The word for the latter is merely the Hebrew shechar, or shichra, transcribed into the Greek "sikera". It is used in the announcement of the angel Gabriel to Zacharias concerning John the Baptist, "He shall drink no wine nor strong drink" (Luke 1.15): John was to be a Nazirite for his whole life, like Samson and Samuel (Internat. Crit. Com. on Luke). Whatever the composition of this "strong drink", all agree that it was alcoholic. John's life was to be peculiar in almost every respect; he lived in the desert; he ate what the desert furnished; his clothing was primitive. None of these renunciations was of obligation for ordinary people; and neither was the renunciation of wine and "strong drink".

Indeed, the distinction of the Nazirite was not that he renounced things that were wrong for

everybody,—this would have been no distinction, —but that he renounced things that were lawful for everybody. John is the only Nazirite named in the New Testament, and he is also the only person recorded in the New Testament to whom wine and "strong drink" are forbidden.

II

With one exception the Greek word rendered wine, in the New Testament, is everywhere oinos, the classic word for the fully fermented beverage. The one exception is in Acts 2.13. The Jews were expressing their amazement at the Gift of Tongues, at Pentecost. "But others mocking said, 'They are filled with new wine'." The word for "new wine" is gleukos. Now the dictionaries say that gleukos is the classic word for the fresh, unfermented grape-juice. That it usually has this sense is undoubted. As we have seen, the juice squeezed from the clusters of grapes into Pharaoh's cup (Gen. 40.11) is called by Josephus (Antiquities 2.5) gleukos. But this passage in the Acts shows that gleukos had a further meaning. The "gleukos" here spoken of could intoxicate. This fact constituted the very point of the sneer. The hostile Jews explained the extraordinary performances of the Apostles on this occasion by saying that they were "filled with gleukos", that is, drink. It has indeed been maintained that they conveyed their meaning not directly, but by way of irony, using the term "new wine" in its ordinary sense of unfermented grape-

juice,—thus: "I suppose you would have us believe that these men got into this extraordinary state by imbibing innocent grape-juice"; insinuating, of course, that they were drunk on genuine old wine; for the Apostles could not have gotten real gleukos, new wine, unfermented, if they had wished, since the feast of Pentecost was eight months after the grape harvest. It is a fact, too, that the Vulgate, or Latin, version of this passage translates gleukos by *mustum,* which always means the unfermented juice. The question is whether gleukos, in addition to its proper sense of unfermented grape-juice, might also mean the newest, or latest, fermented wine. If it could, then the use of the word in classic Greek must have been modified by Grecian Jews under the influence of the old Hebrew word tirosh, which had a like extension of meaning, tirosh meaning the juice from its expression through every stage till it became fully matured wine, or yayin. Greek words were frequently bent from their classic use to parallel Hebrew or Aramaic terms. Is there any evidence that the classic Greek word gleukos was so treated in Bible Greek?

There is conclusive evidence of it. The verse, Job 32.19,

Behold, my breast is as wine which hath no vent;
Like new wine-skins, it is ready to burst,

alludes, beyond question, to fermenting wine, wine that, in excess, will go to the head; yet the Greek of the Septuagint has gleukos, which it terms

"boiling"; that is, through the force of fermentation.

Gleukos, then, could mean "new wine"; that is, wine made at the previous vintage; and this sense best suits the passage in Acts 2.13. In fact, there is no justification for seeking any other. The critics of the Apostles meant just what they said,—that they were drunk on new wine, which was more plentiful and cheaper than the old.

Hastings' Bible Dictionary, II. 34 a, does not doubt that this is the sense of the passage: "Gleukos, new sweet wine, is mentioned in Acts 2.13 as that by which the Jews thought the Apostles were intoxicated at Pentecost. It cannot have been unfermented, as this would not have produced the effect, and Pentecost was eight months after the vintage".

The Encyclopedia Biblica says of this word gleukos and of this passage, in the article on "Wine",—"Gleukos is used of the 'sweet' grape-juice through all the stages of its passage into fermented wine. . . . In the passage before us (Acts 2.13) the reference is clearly to the strongly intoxicating qualities of new and immature wine, in this case wine of the preceding vintage".

The later stage of the gleukos must have coincided with the first stage of "the new wine", spoken of in that passage of our Lord's teaching which tells of new wine in old wine-skins and in new wine-skins, in Matt. 9.17, Mark 2.22, and Luke 5.37-39: Men do not put new wine into old wine-skins, for the skins would burst; but they put new

wine into fresh wine-skins. Again; one who has drunk old wine has no desire for new; for he says, "The old is good". But the Greek for new wine, here, is not one word, but two, "new" "wine", just as in English. And, besides, this new wine could not have been the unfermented juice, for this was not put in the skins. The juice was left in the vats, or perhaps in open jars, until fermentation set in, and then it was transferred for storage to large ox-skins (Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible; Article, Food). The gleukos of Acts 2.13 was the new wine of our Lord's parable in one of its stages.

III

The word oinos, with its compounds, is used for wine in the New Testament some thirty-five times. Half a dozen of these uses are figurative, as "The wine of the wrath of God". For the rest, it is evident enough what this oinos, wine, was. Paul exhorts the saints and the faithful in Christ Jesus, in Ephesus, "Be not drunk with oinos, wherein is riot, but be filled with the Spirit" (Eph. 5.18). In Rev. 17.2 St. John speaks of those who were "drunken with the oinos of her fornication", a figure that would have lost its point, unless the wine could make drunk. St. Paul lays down as a qualification of deacons that they must be "not given to much oinos" (1 Tim. 3.8). He would no more have warned against excess in fresh grape-juice than against excess in water or milk. A few verses earlier (1 Tim. 3.3) he had said that bishops must not be "quarrelsome

over oinos". At least, that is one rendering of the passage. The injunction is repeated in Titus 1.7. In Titus 2.3 he enjoins aged women not to be "enslaved to much oinos".

Oinos being unmistakably alcoholic in these passages, the natural conclusion is that it is alcoholic in other passages where no difference is indicated. Where one and the same oinos will serve acceptably in all the passages, it is superfluous to postulate a second and different. For example, in the very Epistle in which St. Paul warned against excess and quarreling, he tells Timothy (1 Tim. 5.23): "Be no longer a drinker of water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities". This wine is alcoholic.

Paul writes in Rom. 14.21, "It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink oinos, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth". This looks like a counsel against wine. Yet it can be so only if the oinos meant is alcoholic. But how do we know this? How do we know that this oinos is not unfermented grape-juice? For the sound reason that in passages that are unmistakable oinos means the wine that can intoxicate, and there is nothing inconsistent with that sense here. No better reason could be asked. But, if that canon of interpretation holds here, it holds elsewhere. What St. Paul's general doctrine is, as laid down in this and other passages, will be considered later. Here we are only asking what he understands by wine.

In the passage about John the Baptist, already alluded to (Lu. 1.15), "He shall drink neither oinos

nor strong drink", the oinos is obviously, from its correlative "strong drink",—not to speak of the presumption from unmistakable use elsewhere,—an alcoholic beverage; and this is not, I think, denied.

So far, then, we have six passages in which oinos, without question, can intoxicate. We have three others in which it is admitted to be of the same character from presumption and inference.

The Good Samaritan came to the wounded man, "and bound up his wounds, pouring on them oil and oinos" (Luke 10.34). This was obviously a well known remedy; and in fact it is mentioned in Rabbinical literature. The oil and the wine were used separately or mixed. If, now, the wine was alcoholic, it had a real antiseptic value; but, if it was fresh grape-juice, it would have been worthless: sugar and water would have answered as well. In that case, it would be hard to account for its use as a household remedy. Besides, a traveler might well have had a small skin of wine with him,—travelers carry these commodities today;—but how could the Samaritan have produced unfermented grape-juice on the spot? This wine, poured on the wounds, was unmistakably alcoholic. The Good Samaritan carried fermented wine with him, when he went on a journey.

The story of the Crucifixion tells that "They offered him oinos mingled with myrrh: but he received it not" (Mk. 15.23). "It was a merciful Jewish practice to give to those led to execution a draught of strong wine mixed with myrrh, so as to deaden consciousness" (Edersheim's "Life and

Times of Jesus the Messiah''). This oinos, then, was alcoholic: fresh grape-juice, under the circumstances, would have been useless. If it had been desired only to moisten the parched mouth and throat, water would have been best, since there is nothing like it to relieve intense thirst. There would have been no object in offering Jesus fresh grape-juice; and, on the other hand, there would have been no object in his declining it. As it was, he declined the wine, because he chose to suffer and die in full possession of his faculties. Later, when it was solely a matter of relieving his thirst, he accepted the ''vinegar'', as he would have water. ''The translation *vinegar* is incorrect . . . this is simply the ordinary sour wine of the country, which would be procured probably from the soldiers'' (Gould, on Mark 15.36, in the International Critical Commentary). This rough wine, too, was alcoholic. Thus, the first act of Jesus' ministry was the making of alcoholic wine, in Cana of Galilee; and his last act was the drinking of alcoholic wine, on the cross.

Thus far, then, the oinos, wine, of the New Testament is alcoholic.

Let us examine now the familiar passage which contrasts the asceticism of John the Baptist with the indulgence of Jesus. Even fair-minded Jews were perplexed at what seemed the greater piety of the disciples of John and of the Pharisees: these fasted, ''but thy disciples fast not'' (Mark 2.18). The disciples of John and of the Pharisees fasted, because their leaders and teachers did. The disciples of Jesus did not, because Jesus did not.

To many, Jesus' self-indulgence in this direction must have been a scandal,—he a reprover of the clergy and even of the Holy Scriptures, yet eating and drinking just like everybody else! Jesus rebuked this censoriousness, and offered no apologies: "John the Baptist is come, eating no bread nor drinking oinos; and ye say, 'He hath a demon'. The Son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, 'Behold, a gluttonous man, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!' And wisdom is justified of all her children" (Luke 7.33-35). Clearly the oinos that John the Baptist did not drink was the oinos that Jesus did drink. In both cases this oinos was the same as the oinos that we have been examining in other passages, the very same as the oinos of which St. Paul said, "Be not drunken with oinos, wherein is excess". The slanderous term, oinos-bibber that our Lord's enemies applied to him is the same as is used in the Septuagint version of Proverbs 23.20:

Be not among oinos-bibbers,
Among gluttonous eaters of flesh:
For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty.

The oinos-bibber and the drunkard are here one and the same; which shuts out unfermented grape-juice. But the oinos-bibber might not carry his excess to the point of intoxication; a man merited the reproach who drank more than was good for him,—who was too fond of wine; and this is probably as far as our Lord's enemies intended the reproach,—he was too fond of eating and drinking.

That anybody could become so addicted to unfermented grape-juice as to call for rebuke and stigma is improbable; but that this excess could become among all classes so common and so serious and so permanent as to constitute a social nuisance, a public danger, and a national and international sin is too fantastical to be thought of. Did you ever know anyone to go wrong on unfermented grape-juice? Much less whole classes, populations, and races? The gilded youth of Isaiah's day, or of our Lord's, debauched themselves on what the Old Testament calls yayin; the New Testament, oinos; the Vulgate, vinum; in the English language, wine. When Jesus was called a wine-bibber, they meant what we mean when we speak of some one as a drinking man. Jesus said that he did drink; yet they lied when they called him a drinking man, meaning one who drank immoderately.

This oinos, then, was alcoholic.

IV

And now we come to the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. The account of it is given by St. John, 2.1-11, as follows:

"And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there: and Jesus also was bidden, and his disciples, to the marriage. And when the wine failed, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine. And Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come.

His mother saith unto the servants, Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it. Now there were six waterpots of stone set there after the Jews' manner of purifying, containing two or three firkins apiece. Jesus saith unto them, Fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. And he saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the ruler of the feast. And they bare it. And when the ruler of the feast tasted the water now become wine, and knew not whence it was (but the servants that had drawn the water knew), the ruler of the feast calleth the bridegroom, and saith unto him, Every man setteth on first the good wine; and when men have become drunk [Revised Version, 'have drunk freely'], then that which is worse: thou hast kept the good wine until now".

Now was that oinos real, fermented wine, or was it gleukos, fresh grape-juice? First, the word oinos, in place of gleukos, indicates that it was real wine. If St. John meant fresh grape-juice, why did he not use the proper word for fresh grape-juice? Why did he use the word that regularly in Greek literature means the fermented article? And that in the many passages of the New Testament which we have examined means the fermented article? And that St. Paul used when he said, "Be not drunk with oinos, wherein is excess"?

Secondly, the Vulgate, or Latin translation, renders this oinos by vinum. Now vinum means fermented wine; whereas the invariable word for unfermented grape-juice is mustum; whence our "must".

Thirdly, examine the remark of the governor of the feast, in verse 10, to the bridegroom: "Every man setteth on first the good wine; and, when men have drunk freely, then that which is worse: thou hast kept the good wine until now".

Calvin takes it for granted that it was fermented wine: "When God daily gives us a large supply of wine, it is our own fault if his kindness is an incitement to luxury; but, on the other hand, it is an undoubted trial of our sobriety, if we are sparing and moderate in the midst of abundance".—Calvin, Com. on St. John, 2.1-11.

The critical word in this remark of the governor of the feast is that which is here rendered "have drunk freely". The Greek verb used means, in the active, "to make drunk", and, in the passive, "to get drunk". This is its almost universal meaning in classic Greek; and Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament gives this as the sole meaning in the New Testament and the Septuagint. It is the verb used in Luke 12.45: "Shall begin to eat and drink and *to be drunken";* in 1 Thes. 5.7: "They that are drunken are drunken in the night"; in Eph. 5.18: "Be not drunken with wine"; in Rev. 17.2: "They that dwell in the earth were made drunken with the wine of her fornication"; and this is the sense that Thayer gives to the verb in the passage we are examining, John 2.10. The same verb in Jesus ben Sirach, 1.16, means to intoxicate in a figurative sense: "[Wisdom] satiateth [intoxicates] men with her fruits". The Vulgate for St. John 2.10 is, "cum inebriati fuerint", "when they have

become inebriated". The Arabic version of Tatian's Diatessaron here is, in literal English, "at the time of drunkenness". Luther's German Bible gives, "Wenn sie trunken geworden sind". The French, like the later English Versions, is too fine for the bluntness of God's Word, and softens it down. But Wiclif translated the passage thus, "Whanne men ben fulfilled"; and both Tyndall and Cranmer render it, "When men be dronke". Dean Henry Alford, in his translation of the New Testament, renders it, "When men are drunken"; and Samuel Davidson's translation of Tischendorf's text of the New Testament makes this passage, "When they have become drunk". Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, under Food, in discussing oinos, wine, alludes to this very passage as showing the intoxicating power of oinos: "This wine in excess produced methysis" [intoxication] (John 2.10).

Read what the famous scholar and professor, Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, of the Union Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), New York, says of this passage, in his Commentary on the New Testament:

"An attempt is sometimes made to soften down an expression used by the ruler of the feast, 'when men are drunken'. There need, however, be no scruple as to giving the word its ordinary meaning. The remark does but express his surprise at the bridegroom's departure from the ordinary custom, in bringing in so late wine of such excellence as this. The common maxim was that the best wine should be given first, when it could be

appreciated by the guests; the weak and poorer when they had drunk more than enough, and the edge of their taste was blunted".

The remark of the ruler of the feast, then, was a piece of coarse wit; which is decorously slurred over in our English translations. What he really said was that men are apt to give the good wine first, and then, when the guests are pretty drunk, and don't know the difference, he foists the poor wine on them,—a procedure which in this feast the bridegroom had reversed, keeping the best wine until the last. In this remark the governor of the feast was only doing his best to fill his role of fun-maker and comedian. He was expected to keep everything moving, to make everybody feel at home, to crack jokes,—in a word, to be a good entertainer, "master of the revels". Professional fun-makers were no more fastidious then than now: they were as apt to be coarse and vulgar.

In this case, there is no reason to suppose that the remark about the want of discernment in men who were pretty drunk was meant to apply to any one present: it was just a general pleasantry, of a sort that even today would raise a laugh. That, however, on such occasions, even well-known rabbis sometimes drank too freely, we learn from Rabbinical literature. The Jews, as a rule, were temperate; but, on occasions, a little license was looked on as a venial offence.

It is certain, then, that the "governor of the feast" was speaking of alcoholic wine, when he complimented the bridegroom on the excellence of that which had just been offered him and the

guests. It is easy to picture his consternation, had anyone, toward the end of a feast of real wine, presented him with a bowl of unfermented grape-juice! He would probably have viewed it as a reflection on his condition.

The wine, then, that our Lord miraculously created at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee was alcoholic wine of the highest excellence,—a wine that, drunk too freely, would intoxicate. When Christ arrived at the marriage feast, he might have converted the wine he saw there into water. Instead, when the supply gave out, he converted the water into wine. Undoubtedly, on this occasion, he drank himself, with his disciples, with his mother, and the other guests. Jesus, his mother the Blessed Virgin Mary, and his chosen disciples, all drank; and indeed commentators explain the embarrassing shortage of wine by the unexpected addition of Jesus and his disciples, seven guests, to the party already gathered (See Westcott's St. John). This made it the more natural to apply to Jesus for help in the difficulty.

The word wine in this passage, then, as in every other that we have examined, means the fermented, alcoholic beverage.

V

The Lord's Supper.—And now we come to the institution of the Lord's Supper. Was wine, fermented wine, used in it or not?

The story is told by St. Matthew, 26.26-29; St. Mark, 14.22-25; St. Luke, 22.19-20. St. Matthew's account is the fullest, and is as follows:

And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.

Both St. Mark and St. Luke use this same term, "fruit of the vine", for the beverage in the Lord's Supper. The word wine does not appear in any of the accounts.

This feast was, in its early part, the Passover Supper; and the bread and drink consecrated to the new use were the bread and the drink provided for the Passover. The bread was the common bread without the leaven, that is, without yeast. The "fruit of the vine" was what?

The Passover supper was minutely prescribed in all its materials and ritual acts. All these, with one exception, were intended vividly to recall that never-to-be-forgotten night "when Israel came out of Egypt, and the house of Jacob from among the strange people" (Ps. 114.1, Prayer Book); and, with this one exception, they were all ordained in the Law of Moses. There, in Exodus 12, the law of unleavened bread is laid down, and the reason for it given. On "that night of Jehovah" "the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, to send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We are all dead men. And the people took their dough

before it was leavened, their kneading-troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders." . . . "And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt; for it was not leavened, because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any victuals" (Ex. 12.33, 34, 39). In accordance with this ordinance the children of Israel, in their Passover, banish leaven, and eat unleavened bread only, to this very day. The original reason for unleavened bread could not be made plainer: the bread was not leavened, because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry to leaven it. It takes time for bread to "rise"; and the Hebrews had not a minute to spare; Pharaoh might change his mind, as he had before; so "they took their dough before it was leavened". This is amply confirmed in Deuteronomy, 16.3: "Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, even the bread of affliction; for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste: that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life". It was not, then, that there was anything wrong in leaven or praiseworthy in bread without leaven. How could there be? Leavened bread was the ordinary food of the people; and unleavened bread is here called "the bread of affliction". Afterwards leaven was excluded from the sacrifices because the idea of fermentation and decay came to be associated with it; and this idea was strong

in the New Testament, though even here we have "the little leaven that leaveneth the whole lump" used to figure the power of the Gospel. But, however that may be, the unleavened bread of the Passover is explained as clearly as words can by the want of time to leaven the bread in the hurry of the exodus from Egypt.

The Jewish people have always taken this view, as a matter of course. In the service for the Eve of Passover, a service of immemorial antiquity, after the first cup of wine, the Reader, "partly removing the cover from the unleavened bread, continues",

> "Behold, O friends, the meagre bread
> Our fathers ate in fear and dread" etc.

There is no exaltation of unleavened bread here, as being purer or better; it is "meagre bread", eaten originally "in fear and dread".

Then "one of the younger members of the family will ask these questions (in accordance with Ex. 12.26, 'And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say' etc.): 'What is the meaning of the unleavened bread?' " To which the Reader: "This custom is intended to remind us of the memorable fact that our fathers in Egypt were driven from the country with such haste by their former tormentors that they not even had time to leaven the bread for their journey".

Scripture and tradition thus concur in explaining the want of leaven in the Passover bread as

a misfortune due to the lack of time to use yeast. There was no objection to leaven in itself.

Of the other articles prescribed by the law of Moses to be eaten at the Passover, the lamb and the bitter herbs, nothing need be said.

Of the beverage it is different. Long before Christ wine was a prescribed feature of this feast. The ritual fixed the number of cups to be drunk; it told just at what points in the service they were to be drunk; it required that the wine be red, and that it be mixed with water. Yet there is not a word about wine or any other drink in the ordinance of Moses. The wine was an addition. Each of the company must be provided with at least four cups of red wine, even if the money had to come from the fund for public charity or was raised by the pledging of one's garments or of one's labor. The reason for mixing the wine with water was that, unmixed, it was too strong, and there was more danger of intoxication. The benediction could not be said over the cup till it had been mixed. Additional mixed wine could be drunk between the second and third cups, but not between the third and fourth. This curious distinction had a reason: between the second and third cups the eating was going on, and it was believed that people were not apt to overdrink while eating; but the eating ceased at the ceremonial drinking of the third cup, and "wine after meat maketh a man drunk".

The want of Scriptural authority or precedent for wine in the Passover Supper explains the absence of any inquiry as to its symbolical meaning

by "one of the younger members of the family". The bread is inquired about; the bitter herbs are inquired about; the Passover sacrifice is inquired about; for all these had their reason in the events of that great night. But it is not asked, What is the meaning of the wine? for that was added by the Jewish church just for the innocent pleasure that it gave.

Another thing. The fermentation of yeast and of wine is chemically the same. But, first, the ancients did not know this; and, secondly, if they had, it would not have made any difference in this instance. The Jews of today know it, but they drink fermented wine in their Passover Supper. The Jews of the Scriptures were careful to search out and destroy every particle of leavened bread before the Passover began; but they did not, any more than today, banish fermented wine. There is no hint of any such thing. On the contrary, well-to-do Jews gave money to their destitute brethren to purchase wine and other Passover materials, so that every one might share in the national feast. This they do today; and the raising of this Passover fund is an important feature of synagogue life every year.

Was this wine of the Passover fermented? The presumption is that the wine was of the character designated by the same terms elsewhere. Now our examination of the Old Testament shows that yayin was always fermented, and tirosh almost always. The juice of the grape was tirosh from the moment it was expressed till it became fully fermented, and then it was yayin. Moreover, the

wine of the Passover was red. But the redness of wine comes from the pigment in the skin of the grape when fermented. Moreover, the wine must be mixed with water on the express ground that it was less liable to intoxicate. And, lastly, the Passover, came half a year after the grape harvest; and there is not a hint in the Rabbinical literature, let alone in the Old Testament, that the Jews ever employed any device to keep the juice from fermenting.

The testimony of learned Jews is unanimous that the ordinary wine of the Passover was the fully fermented juice of the grape, red, and mixed with water; of Jewish, not Gentile, make. These scholars fix no date for the introduction of wine into the Passover feast; they all refer it to a time so long before Christ that the memory of man knows no beginning of it. A learned Jew of New York writes: "The rabbinic tradition ascribes it to the Men of the Great Assembly, who flourished about 400 B. C. But there is no proof of the correctness of this tradition". Professor Caspar Levias, Superintendent of the Plaut Memorial Hebrew Free School, of Newark, N. J., writes the following interesting letter on the subject of the ancient Jewish wines:

"In reply to your inquiries, I beg to say that—

"1. The wine at the Passover supper does not differ from the wine on Sabbaths and other holidays. It is used in consequence of a law, whose origin and antiquity is unknown, to sanctify the holidays.

"2. The term, "fruit of the vine", is used in the

benediction for the simple reason that the noun *wine* may in Hebrew be used also for other beverages, as date-wine, cider, etc. Since the sanctification is done by grape-wine, the term "fruit of the vine" is the proper expression. The second reason for the term is that wine is an *artificial* product, for which God could not be thanked directly.

"3. All wine used for religious ceremonies is called yayin, that is, fermented wine, and none other. It must be added that the ancients usually drank their wine mixed with water, from one-third to two-thirds. There is no reason to assume that matters were different in the times of Jesus. In fact, the use of unfermented wine is never mentioned in the Bible. Already Melchizedeck uses, in what is, no doubt, a religious ceremony, bread and wine. Libation required yayin, fermented wine.

"4. In the Bible the term tirosh does not mean "unfermented wine" in the modern sense, but the "raw product from which wine is manufactured", just as yitshar means the "raw product from which oil is manufactured". In Talmudic usage tirosh includes all kinds of sweet juices and must. Special preservation of unfermented wine is nowhere mentioned in rabbinic literature.

"5. The Aramaic name for wine is hamra. This is the only word for it in all Aramaic languages at all periods, and means "fermented".

"6. The only rule for Passover wine is that it be made in vessels which are clean from chamets, leaven. C. LEVIAS".

The following letter, also, in answer to like inquiries of mine, from Rabbi B. Hailperin, Chief Rabbi of the Orthodox Hebrews of Newark, New Jersey, is full of curious learning that is instructive for our subject.

"To answer your queries seriatim:—

"1. Reason for the use of wine at the Passover Supper:—The Talmud states (Berachoth 35 A) that 'whenever we render praise unto the Lord, we must have wine accompanying it'. The reason is inferred from the sentence (Judges IX. 13), 'Wine rejoiceth God and man'. That it rejoiceth man we know, for the Psalmist states (Ps. CIV. 15) 'Wine rejoiceth the heart of man'. But how could it be instrumental in bringing gladness unto God? By using wine in connection with our praises and exaltations uttered unto the glory of the Lord.

"Consequently it has been made a law that every Jew must use wine with every manifestation of praise and thanksgiving rendered unto his Maker. That the Jew has faithfully clung unto this law is evident from the fact that wine is used at the following occasions:

a. Rite of circumcision.—After the operation has been performed, the usual prayer is pronounced over wine.

b. Redemption of the first-born.—This ceremony, done in accordance with the Law (Ex. XIII. 13), is also marked by the use of wine.

c. Marriage ceremony.—The minister recites the seven blessings, while holding a cup of wine in his hands.

d. 'Kiddush'.—This beautiful and impressive home service, the sanctification of the Sabbath and holidays, is ushered in with a blessing over the 'fruit of the vine'. The Talmud says (Pesachim 106 B), 'Remember the Sabbath day, remember it with wine'.

e. 'Habdallah'.—The benediction which marks the termination of the Sabbath and the holiday is also delivered with the usual cup of wine.

f. Having proved the application of the law,—that no praise should be rendered without wine,—let us consider the use of four cups of wine at the Passover, or Seder, service.

"The Talmud states (Talmud Jerusalem, Pesachim, Tractate 10, Halacha I.; also Midrash Rabba, Parshah 88), that on Passover we are to praise the Lord four times, because God speaks of our redemption in four different terms; which signify that our freedom was a four-fold one. For we read (Exodus VI. 6-7), 'Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am the Lord, and I will bring you out from the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched-out arm, and with great judgment, and I will take you to me'.

"The terms 'bring you out', 'rid you', 'redeem you', and 'take you' are four different expressions applied to the redemption of Israel from Egyptian bondage. Consequently, that redemption was a four-fold one. In consideration therefor we manifest our gratitude to our Redeemer in the same measure as He once bestowed his kindness upon us; namely, with four different

praises. And, as no praise should be rendered without wine, so we must, in accordance with the law, have four cups of wine at the commemoration of the delivery from Egypt. The Talmud, therefore, states (Pesochim 108) that every person must have four cups of wine for the Seder service; and, if he cannot afford to buy it, he is to be supplied with wine from the Passover Relief Fund, a charitable institution which serves the purpose of providing Passover victuals for the poor of the community.

"2. The benediction over wine:—In making the benediction over anything we are about to eat, we do not mention the name of the thing actually eaten, but rather use the expression 'the fruit of', etc. For instance, upon eating an apple, the blessing is 'over the fruit of the tree'; upon partaking of a potato, the blessing is over 'the fruit of the ground'. But, as the vine was considered superior to all trees, a special blessing is accorded to its product, namely, 'the fruit of the vine' (gefen).

"Thus far, I have given you the Talmudic law on the matter. My personal opinion is that special benedictions have been ordered for bread and for wine, because in those days bread and wine were considered the necessaries of life. Thus we find (Genesis XIV. 18) that 'Melchizedek, king of Salem, met Abraham with bread and wine', apparently the most important food-stuffs of that day.

"3. Is grape-juice used for Passover?

"The Jews have always used fermented, strong

wine, equal to the one used upon the Altar, as we find (Numbers XXVIII. 7), 'Thou shalt cause the strong wine to be poured unto the Lord for a drink-offering'. The Talmud tells (Nedarim 49.B) of a prominent woman who once reproached Rabbi Judah for being extremely red in face, a fact which she attributed to his excessive drinking. The Rabbi replied, 'I never drink any wine but to Kiddush and to Habdallah, and, when Passover comes around, I drink the four cups of wine, and I become so severely affected that my head aches for seven weeks, until Shebbuoth'. Surely had grape-juice answered the purpose, the renowned rabbi would not have hazarded his health by drinking strong wine. We must, therefore, conclude that it was a law of binding force that induced the rabbi to sacrifice his health, in order to prove his adherence to the law.

"4. Preserving the grape-juice:—To my knowledge, the preservation of grape-juice and preventing it from becoming fermented is nowhere mentioned in Rabbinical literature.

"5. Present-day rule for Passover wine:—The following rules are usually complied with:—

(a) It shall be good strong wine (the reason being stated above); (b) it shall be red, for the Talmud states (Baba Bathra 97 B) 'that red wine is the best of its kind', inferring it from Proverbs XXIII. 31, 'Look not thou upon the wine when it is red'; which signifies the superiority of that color.

RABBI B. HAILPERIN,
Chief Rabbi Orthodox Hebrews of Newark."

The use of the term "fruit of the vine" is explained in much the same way by all the scholars that I have consulted. First, this term is free from the ambiguity of yayin, which may, in this later use, mean wine made from other than grapes. Second, it is preferred to the word yayin, in the Benediction, because, in strictness, God gives the natural, not the artificial, product,—grape juice, not made wine. The force of this reason, however, is weakened by the circumstance that in the Benediction on the bread, in the Passover Service, the word "bread" is used, not grain: "Praise be to Thee, Eternal, our God, Lord of the universe, who makest bread to grow out of the earth". But as to the force of this expression, "fruit of the vine",—whatever its explanation,—there has never been any difference of opinion among the Jews; and, in this, Christian scholars have been at one with the Jewish: church and synagogue have, from the beginning, understood "the fruit of the vine" to be fully fermented wine. It is no wonder that the brilliant scholar, Dr. Alfred Edersheim, perhaps the most learned Jew in the antiquities of his people that has espoused Christianity in centuries, in his "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah", dismisses the suggestion that the wine of the Passover was unfermented with contempt: "The contention that it was *unfermented* wine is not worth serious discussion" (Note 2, page 485, vol. II.). The Anglican divine, Dr. Cunningham Geikie, in his "Life of Christ", assumes, as not requiring demonstration, that the wine used by our Lord, at this feast, was the usual

fermented wine of the grape: "A cup of red wine, mingled with a fourth part of water, to make it a pleasant and temperate drink". In discussing the miracle at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, Dr. Geikie says that Jesus thereby sanctioned the temperate use of fermented wine.

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 3d Edition, under the article "Wine", speaks as follows of this term, "fruit of the vine": "The fruit of the vine is literally the grape. But the Jews from time immemorial have used this phrase to designate the wine partaken of on sacred occasions, as at the Passover and at the eve of the Sabbath. The Mishna expressly states that in pronouncing blessings 'the fruit of the vine' is the consecrated expression for *yayin*. . . . How naturally the phrase 'the fruit of the vine' is put for wine is seen from Herodotus (Book 1.212), where Tomyris, the Queen of the Massagetae, is made to employ the three expressions, 'the fruit of the vine' . . . to denote the wine by which a part of her army was so intoxicated as to fall an easy prey to Cyrus. Wine is not whiskey, but compare the phrase 'old rye' for the latter. . . . Our Lord, in instituting the Supper after the Passover, availed himself of the expression invariably employed by his countrymen in speaking of the wine of the Passover".

It is worth while to call attention here to Dean Stanley's conjecture (Christian Institutions, Chapter II.) as to the "upper room", in which the Supper was held: "They were collected together . . . in one of the large upper rooms

above the open court of the inn, or caravanserai, to which they had been guided". The very possible location of the banqueting apartment over a wine-room, as indicated by the Dean, is worthy of mention, owing to the naturalness of this in Palestine and among the Jewish people. All sorts of religious rites are celebrated by Jews in just such places today in our large cities, the wine-room not having with them offensive associations. A friend tells me, "Till recent years this was Anglo-Saxon Christian usage as well. As a boy, I attended meetings of the Church Missionary Society in the Assembly Room over the Freemasons' Tavern, a leading public house adjoining our London parish of St. John's Battersea". If Dean Stanley's conjecture is correct, the wine of the Last Supper was probably bought from the wine-room below.

CHAPTER IV

THE EPISTLES

Thus it is certain that the beverage used in the Last Supper was fermented wine, a fact that was never questioned through all the ages, and that is questioned by no scholar of standing now. Jesus drank alcoholic wine, and gave it to his disciples to drink, at that Passover Supper.

In instituting the new feast, "after Supper", he again gave the same wine to his apostles. He enjoined them all, and all his disciples, till his coming again at the Last Day, to drink of it: "Drink of this, all* of you".

I

St. Paul.—St. Paul's testimony only confirms what the rest of the New Testament makes clear, —that the wine of the Jews and first Christians was alcoholic. From his pen we have the earliest account of the instituting of the Lord's Supper; and this account contains the earliest recorded words of Jesus. The passage occurs in the course of a rebuke to the Corinthian church for misconduct in connection with the Lord's Supper. The whole passage, 1 Corinthians, 11, beginning with verse 20, is as follows: *When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper: for in your eating each one*

*The word "all", in the Greek, is in the most emphatic position.

taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What, have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and put them to shame that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you? In this I praise you not. For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and, when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come. (This last sentence is thought by some to be Paul's, not Christ's.)

Scholars are agreed that at first, and for some years, the Lord's Supper was celebrated in connection with a love-feast, or Agapé. Some say that the Lord's Supper came just after; others, just before; others, that the love-feast was included in the Lord's Supper. This passage from St. Paul indicates that in Corinth at that time it came after. To the Agapé everybody that could brought his contribution of food and drink, for all to share in common and as equals. Naturally the well-to-do brought more than the poor; and naturally, too, after a while, they began to flock by themselves, and to dine off their own palatable contributions. This had reached such a pass in Corinth, when St. Paul wrote, as to be a scandal: some surfeited

themselves; others did not have enough to eat. Nay, while the poor did not even have enough bread, the rich not only had all the food they could eat, but they kept drinking wine till they were drunk: *One is hungry and another drunken.* This was a shame of a love-feast; and St. Paul told them so. Moreover, this debauch left them in no condition of soul or body to partake of the Lord's Supper,—the poor, hungry and angry; the rich, stuffed and drunk: truly they were eating and drinking to themselves damnation.

The significant word for us, here, is "drunk", —"some are drunk". In fact, this one word is sufficient proof that the wine of the Lord's Supper was fermented. For this reason those who are set on having it unfermented make desperate efforts to break the force of this word "drunk". They say it means, instead, gorged (with food), —"One is hungry, another is gorged". But the consensus of authorities is against them. The Authorized Version gives it, "One is hungry, and another is drunken". The Revised Versions, English and American, give the same. Wiclif has, "And sothely another is hungrie, another foresoth is drunkyn"; Tyndale, "And one is hongrye, and another is dronken"; Cranmer, "One is hongry, and another is droncken". The German version is the same. The Rheims has, "One certes is an hungred, and an other is drunke". Luther has, "Einer ist hungrig, der Andere trunken". The Vulgate uses "ebrius", that is, "inebriated". Moreover, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament gives, as the only meaning of the

Greek verb used by St. Paul, *methyo,* "to be drunken"; and it refers to this very passage. Hastings' International Critical Commentary says of this passage (the volume on First Corinthians is by Bishop Archibald Robertson, Bishop of Exeter, and the Rev. Dr. Alfred Plummer, of Trinity College, Oxford),—"There is no need to water down the usual meaning of *methyein.* . . . Hungry poor meeting intoxicated rich at what was supposed to be a supper of the Lord!" Principal Edwards, the famous Calvinistic Methodist theologian, in his Commentary on First Corinthians, says of this passage, "There can be but little doubt that Chrysostom is right in giving the word *methyei* its full meaning: 'He does not say, *drink to satiety,* but *is drunk'.* Long afterwards Ambrose was compelled to forbid the use of wine at festivals held in honor of the martyrs, because it led to revelry and drunkenness".

St. Paul, then, charged the well-to-do Corinthian Christians with getting drunk when they came together for the love-feast and sacrament. The wine provided for the love-feast was the same as for the Lord's Supper; and this wine was alcoholic: they got drunk on it. Now let us see how St. Paul met this shameful situation.

He never said a word against wine at the love-feast or the Lord's Supper,—not one word. What he did find fault with was the well-to-do people's drinking it all up, so that there was none left for the poor. He blamed them for not sharing their wine and food with those who had none. And his

remedy for the evil was, what? To let alcoholic wine alone? Not at all. His remedy was to do their eating and drinking at home, if they were too hungry to wait, where the temptation to excess would be gone or lessened; and then to come together, their appetites satisfied, to eat the bread and drink the cup of the Lord. St. Paul not only permits, but takes for granted, as if the question had never been raised, the use of alcoholic wine alike in the social love-feast and in the solemn sacrament. And as to the latter he asserts that he delivered to them only that which he had himself received of the Lord: that is, his claim of divine authority covers this fermented wine, as well as the bread, in the Lord's Supper.

Therefore, even if otherwise inclined to it, he would not have dared to alter what his Master had prescribed. But he did not feel the inclination; for, where he was free to forbid real wine, that is, at the love feast, concerning which Jesus had given no commandment, he did not do it. What he did was to caution them about the love feast: "You have homes: eat and drink there". What he hit at was not drinking, any more than eating; it was excess and disorder: that was all. What he aimed at was temperance, not abstinence. Had there been no overeating or overdrinking at their love feast, but moderation and kindly consideration, he would have had nothing to say. The wrong was in the intemperance and in the spirit behind it.

Now, if St. Paul cannot be trusted on this matter of principal importance, he cannot be trusted

in anything. But, if he is trusted, then all that has been said about the wine of the Gospels and Epistles is directly or inferentially confirmed by him. If fermented wine was used in the Apostolic church, under the eye of the chief of the Apostles, as a matter of course, then the fight against recognizing it everywhere else in the New Testament might as well be abandoned: the citadel has been captured. Even the outrageous misuse and excess of alcoholic wine in the Lord's Supper did not suggest that such wine should be banished, and unfermented grape-juice substituted. We have here as aggravated an instance of the danger of wine, even for sacred uses, as can be conceived, —the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ turned into a selfish Bacchanalian orgie; and yet St. Paul does not say, "Abstain!" He only says, "Be temperate". It is quite possible that among these sacrilegious convivialists may have been persons unable to control their appetites, when once started,—the very situation so often cited for total abstinence today;—yet St. Paul did not say to Christians, "Abstain!" He only said, "Avoid excess"; "Drink at home"; "Drink at the Lord's Supper in the proper spirit".

Observe, finally, in the passages from the Epistles earlier quoted, to show the alcoholic nature of their oinos,—as the warning to bishops not to be "quarrelsome over oinos" (1 Tim. 3.3), and to elderly women not to be "enslaved to much oinos" (Titus 2.3),—that, while this wine can intoxicate, yet it is not prohibited. St. Paul only warns against excess ("much wine") and against

quarreling over it and being enslaved to it. Likewise the drinking that St. Peter condemns is the excess that may be described as "winebibbings", and which has its place in this evil catalogue,—"lasciviousness, lusts, winebibbings, revellings, carousings, and abominable idolatries" (1 Pet. 4.3): in a word, drinking that amounts to debauchery. The moderate drinking of self-respecting people, whether deacons, bishops, aged women, or the ordinary run of church-members, is not touched by these prohibitions. They are as free to drink wine (or "strong drink") as water.

If these Apostles had disapproved of a moderate use of wine, why did they express themselves so awkwardly and misleadingly? They could write plainly and vigorously, when they wished. Yet any teetotaler of today puts his disapproval with vastly more force and directness. "Touch not, taste not, handle not,"—who could misunderstand that? Why this paltering with "excess" and "quarrelsomeness" and "bibbings", if their meaning was really, "Let it alone"? When St. Paul meant to condemn falsehood, he said, "Lie not" (Col. 3.9). Why did he not say, "Drink not", if that was what he meant? Indeed, to condemn excess is to admit a moderate and proper use. If I say, "Don't dance too much", I allow a moderate amount of dancing. But will I say, "Don't gamble too much"? No; I say, "Don't gamble at all". If I warn my son, leaving his home, "Don't get drunk on your wine and strong drink" ("Be not drunk with wine"), I tacitly allow any use short of excess. Are we to believe that these Apostles

expressed themselves so blunderingly on a question of morals that the whole world misunderstood them, in fact understood them to mean the very contrary of what they did mean, for 1,800 years, and almost the whole world so misunderstands them today? And that, too, when they were under the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost?

The Apostolic church, then, used alcoholic wine as a beverage; it used it in the love feast; it used it in the Lord's Supper. St. Paul, in censuring the abuses that had grown up in Corinth in connection with the Lord's Supper, does not reprove the use of alcoholic wine. He assumes, as though a question had never been raised even in his own mind, that the wine used in the Corinthian church was the same as that used by our Lord in instituting the sacrament; and he claims knowledge of the sacrament by revelation from our Lord himself. This attitude of his toward alcoholic wine is exactly that which, on other evidence, ample and cumulative, we find in Jesus, in the Jewish church of his day, in Hebrew history from the beginning. They all agree that alcoholic wine is a joyful and pleasant thing, for which a special benediction is due to God; but which must be religiously guarded from abuse.

Hastings' Bible Dictionary, II. 34-a, thus sums up the Bible teaching as to wine: "The study of the names applied to wine shows that they are, for the most part, evidently synonyms, and that the substance indicated by them all was one which, if used to excess, was liable to cause intoxication. An attempt has been made to obtain a textual

support for total abstinence by differentiating intoxicating from unfermented wine in the biblical terminology; but it is only special pleading without adequate foundation. The teaching of Scripture as to the pernicious effects of intemperance in any form is clear and explicit, and the Apostle Paul has stated the case for total abstinence in Rom. 14 in a way which does not require the treacherous aid of doubtful exegesis for its support".

II

But what of this teaching of St. Paul's as to the obligation a Christian is under to forego his lawful liberty where it may prove a stumbling-block to a weak brother? Did Paul intend by this to disallow wine?

In the light of the hospitable attitude of the Old Testament and of Jesus toward wine the question answers itself. St. Paul could not have required or recommended total abstinence as a universal or usual practice without setting up a stricter obligation than the prophets and seers of the Old Dispensation, or than Jesus himself. It is true that various Christians have at times found Jesus over-tolerant, and have attempted to correct his laches,—as indeed the rigorists of his own day did; but St. Paul was not one of them. St. Paul knew that Jesus used wine himself; that he provided it for others; and that he commanded his church to drink it in the Blessed Sacrament, till his coming again. If Jesus saw nothing inconsistent with the most boundless and tender charity

in his use of wine, it is not to be supposed that St. Paul did. This injunction of St. Paul was not something new, any more than his injunction against lying, fornication, or theft. He was only applying to a particular subject a principle as old as Revelation.

However, though the question answers itself, let us, since so much has been made of this teaching, and so wrongly,—examine it from other angles. Did St. Paul, then, mean to enjoin total abstinence as the Christian practice?

Paul's Weak Brother.—The passages in point are Rom. 14. 13, 15, 21; 1 Cor. 8.13:

Let us not therefore judge one another, any more: but judge ye this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock in his brother's way, or an occasion of falling. . . . For, if because of meat thy brother is grieved, thou walkest no longer in love. Destroy not with thy meat him for whom Christ died. . . . It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth. Wherefore, if meat causeth my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I cause not my brother to stumble.

Now, first, the wine of these passages is surely alcoholic, since the danger to the weak brother in unfermented grape-juice is so remote and so tenuous as not to be worth mentioning. But there is nothing to differentiate the wine that St. Paul speaks of here from the wine he speaks of elsewhere, or from the wine that other New Testament writers speak of; which is a further confirmation of the alcoholic character of New Testament wine.

Secondly, those who rest the case for total abstinence on this teaching virtually admit that drinking is in itself right; for this teaching applies only to things lawful,—to things that are to be given up, not because they are wrong, but because they may lead a weak brother to offend. No one would seek to dissuade from falsehood and theft on this principle: these are wrong, even if they caused no weak brother to offend, because they are wicked in themselves, as a defiance of God: the strong brother needs this sort of abstinence as much as the weak one. That St. Paul recommends total abstinence when wine might cause the weak brother to offend is evidence enough that he looked on drinking wine as he did on eating meat, as lawful and right,—the one as lawful and right as the other,—and both to be abstained from under the same considerations and to the same extent. Christians surely were free to eat meat, as they saw fit: yet this liberty, if unabridged, might cause a weak brother to offend his conscience (however mistaken that conscience) by eating meat that he knew had been offered to idols. Again, there were vegetarian societies then, and long before, that made it a matter of conscience to abstain from meat. There were, too, the Pythagoreans, who, besides abstaining from wine and meat, made it a matter of conscience to abstain from beans, *abstinete a fabis.* These all, even though not Christians, ought to be regarded by Christians in the exercise of their lawful liberty: these weak brethren must not be caused to offend.

Drinking, then, according to this passage may

be against Christian charity; it is not against Christian law; wrong in itself it is not.

Let us now examine this principle of Christian charity.

What St. Paul had in mind, indeed, may not have been the peril of excess or of appetite at all, but rather the conscientious scruple against particular things, or particular uses of things, as being wrong in themselves. Every specification and illustration that he gives points this way. Some thought it wrong to eat meat; others, to drink wine; others to use certain days (perhaps the Sabbath) as common. Others thought it wrong to eat meat that had been offered to idols. In each instance, they conceived the wrong in the thing itself, not in an immoderate appetite or use. It was, therefore, superstition that moved these people, not a reasonable prudence. It was not a matter of fleshly appetite, but of mental error; and this is the point of St. Paul's correction, "All things indeed are clean". We know that wine, like meat, was objected to on this ground, for St. Augustine tells us (On the Morals of the Manichaeans, XIV. 31), "Because wine too was used in libations to the gods of the Gentiles, many weaker brethren, accustomed to purchase such things, preferred to abstain entirely from flesh and wine rather than run the risk of having fellowship, as they considered it, with idols, even ignorantly". Indeed the Wesleyan theologian, the Rev. Dr. Joseph Agar Beet, agreeing with St. Augustine, takes the wine in this very verse, "It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to

do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth" (Rom. 14.21), to mean, not wine in general, but "wine offered to idols"; and he compares Deut. 32.38 and Isa. 57.6.

It is not disputed, indeed, that the principle St. Paul lays down has a far wider application than the instances he had in mind. St. Augustine recognizes this, in section 35, in stating one purpose of the abstinence from meat and wine to be the discouragement of excess. But it is well to bear in mind that the particular charity which St. Paul urged was a concession to superstition,—a concession that may not go beyond a certain point.

St. Paul cited the man who *hath faith to eat all things* as a man strong in the faith: *I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself* (Rom. 14.14). Over against this Christian of robust faith, *he that is weak eateth herbs* (Rom. 14.2); that is, is a vegetarian from conscience. The vegetarian's faith is weak; but, so far as it goes, St. Paul teaches, it ought not to be despised or flouted. As faith, it ought to be deferred to and encouraged; that is, so far as it is faith; but surely its weakness is not to be encouraged: this is a fault, not a virtue. What then? The weakness must be tolerated, for the sake of the faith. It can indeed be rebuked, so it be in a spirit of love, and not to the hurt of the faith. The Christian who thinks it wrong to eat meat (the Apostolic church probably had these, who had been imperfectly converted from Essenism) is surely not to be told that he is right. He is not to be dealt with roughly; but equally he

is not to be led to think that other Christians agree with him. Better informed Christians finding themselves at table with him ought not to eat meat, if he, through moral cowardice, might be led to do the same, to the hurt of his conscience; nor, again, if their meat-eating would cause him grief; nor, again, if it might lead him to withdraw from their fellowship. The Christian strong in the faith, who well knows the indifferency of meats and drinks,—all things, indeed, are clean,—of times and seasons, should abate of his liberty, or even, under circumstances, sacrifice it, out of charity to his weak brother. But still it remains that this over-scrupulousness is a weakness, a fault. The Church must tolerate it, must even treat it tenderly; but encourage it the Church must not. The weak brother's weakness is a weakness to the Church as well. If the Church were made up only of weak brothers, it would be a very unsatisfactory body indeed,—far from what Christ intended it to be. The church must have a tender regard to the weak brother; but it has also, and even more, to cherish and vindicate the glorious liberty of the children of God. It cannot allow itself, through excessive complaisance, to become weak, for it is set to be the pillar and ground of the truth, the mighty army of the Living God, conquering and to conquer. Liberty and truth are essentials of the Gospel, and the church must proclaim these glad tidings throughout all the world, unto all the inhabitants thereof; and it must not cease proclaiming them, till they be incorporated in the creed and heart of the race.

The truth shall make you free; and the weak in the faith who scruple over meats and drinks, and times and seasons, are not to be allowed to obstruct the Gospel; not to be allowed to pervert others to their ignorance and error; not to be allowed to set up their defective, yes, their false, Gospel as a rival to the *perfect law, the law of liberty,* which whoso looketh into *shall be blessed in his doing* (James 1.25). The church can tolerate a private practice or private belief that is defective, but it cannot tolerate a rival Gospel. To do so would be, not charity, but unfaithfulness. The Christian weak in the faith is not to be disturbed so long as his error does not vitiate his life, and so long as he is content to hold his error in a private, individual, modest fashion. But, as soon as he erects it into an aggressive, proselyting, intolerant faction or heresy, he is to be given place to, *in the way of subjection, no, not for an hour* (Gal. 2.5); then the church must cry aloud and spare not. Then these weak brothers are become *false brethren,* who *spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they may bring us into bondage* (Gal. 2.4). A weak brother is tolerable, but a weak church, never! Christian charity has its place; it has also its limits. The weak brother has his claims; he has also his obligations. The strong brother has his obligations; he has also his rights. It may be his duty to concede a practice; it is not his duty to concede a principle. It is his duty not to concede it, if the concession be demanded. He may, perhaps, for the occasion, waive, but he may not concede, it. The

strong should guard against pride and contempt; but the weak should equally guard against censoriousness. In this 14th chapter of Romans St. Paul is not only warning the strong; he is also rebuking the weak. He does not coddle, he rebukes them. In the last portion of the previous chapter he had condemned over-indulgence; in the present chapter he is condemning excessive scrupulousness. This is a fact too important to be overlooked, as it often is. This weakness, this over-scrupulousness, is a fault, and St. Paul penned this reproof of it. When he exclaimed, *Who art thou that judgest the servant of another? to his own lord he standeth or falleth* (verse 4), he is rebuking the weak brother. He tells him flatly that the man whom he is condemning is not a household slave, but the servant of God; to God therefore he is responsible: "It is to his own master that he is responsible. To him he must show whether he has used or misused his freedom. Yea, in spite of your censoriousness, he will be held straight, for the same Lord who called him on conditions of freedom to his Kingdom is mighty to hold him upright": so Sanday & Headlem, in the International Critical Commentary. Then the Apostle turns to another instance of similar scrupulousness, the superstitious observance of days. At a later date he summed up, with characteristic vigor, the whole principle in these words to the Colossians, 2.16, 17: *Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day.*

Mark, "Let no man judge you in respect of drink".

Do you, my friend, judge another in respect of drink? Then the Bible is against you. You may judge yourself, but not another.

The strong, then, must consider the weak. The weak must not erect his weakness into a law for others. Neither must the strong do the same thing in his behalf. The weak must not expect to have everything done for him: he must be willing to fight a part of his battle himself, as well as to bear some of the inconveniences of his weakness. We ought to become all things to all men, but not to the point of self-obliteration. A world ordered for the sole convenience of weaklings is surely not the world of freedom and joy and light contemplated by the Gospel.

For example, in this very matter of meat-eating, Americans eat too much meat, to the undoing of their digestion, the over-stimulus of their physical energies, and an excessive craving for alcohol. Must we moderate meat-eaters, then, turn vegetarians? Or must we omit meat when we have guests that we know are too fond of it? Or, when they ask for a second helping, must we kindly, but firmly, refuse? Yet this is possible,—that if everybody gave up meat, the country would be healthier; it is certain many a weak brother would be saved. Yet everybody feels that the Pauline principle, *If meat causeth my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh forevermore, that I cause not my brother to stumble* (1 Cor. 8.13), stops far short of this. St. Paul lived up to his own prin-

ciple; and meat (on the question whether kosher or tref; whether offered to idols or not; whether tabu, from the Pythagorean principle of the kinship of all life) was a frequent cause of stumbling to the weak Christian. But St. Paul did not, therefore, become a vegetarian. When with the weak brother, he deferred to his scruples. That was all, and that was enough. The Pauline principle is just a kindly common-sense.

And so of all other lawful indulgences; there is not one that some weak brother is not offended by. There is not one whose entire elimination would not save several weak brothers, for whom Christ died. Take the matter of jewelry. It is not a necessity; it is a luxury. On the one hand, it ministers a legitimate satisfaction. On the other, its lure is so powerful that, quite possibly, it does, on the whole, more harm than good. Some deny themselves necessaries of life to buy it. Others, who could afford a modest purchase, go beyond their means, running into debt, or leaving debts unpaid. It is, besides, an occasion of envyings, jealousies, heart-burnings, pride, vanity, ostentation. Worst of all, jewelry has lured many a girl and woman to her fall; and is doing it today, and will do it. If merchants in this line told all they knew on this subject, the public would be shocked. It is also true that every time a woman decks herself in jewels, it may cause some weak sister to offend. It is certain to do so sometimes. It is certain that, if the wearing of jewelry were given over entirely, these weak sisters would not offend,—certainly not in this way. Moreover, the

very Apostle that is quoted against wine has used much stronger language against jewelry. What he says of drinking no wine is from consideration of the stumbling brother; it is with an "if". But his condemnation of jewelry is categorical; he seems to condemn it in itself: *I desire . . . that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness and sobriety; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment* (1 Tim. 2.8,9). And, while no other Apostle than St. Paul is claimed against wine, St. Peter confirms, and almost seems to quote, him, against jewelry: *Whose* adorning [that is, wives'] *let it not be the outward adorning of braiding the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel* (1 Peter 3.3). Is it not, then, our duty to wear no jewels *while the world standeth?* It is not only Demetrius the silversmith (Acts 19.24) that utters an emphatic No; the good sense of Christendom repudiates the suggestion as an absurd extreme. We have a duty in the premises; we should consider those whom we know to have a weakness in this way; we should forego somewhat for their sake. But, as long as we use judgment and consideration, we do no wrong in wearing jewels. It is our duty not to put temptation in the way of the weak; but it is also the duty of the weak to keep out of the way of temptation. The weak brother ought not to expect to enjoy the same freedom as if he were strong; he should be willing to accept some of the penalties of his weakness. Society cannot be reconstructed for his accommo-

dation. The Pauline principle is just a kindly common sense.

Automobiles cause many a weak brother to offend. Men have stolen, to buy an automobile, or to maintain it. Others have mortgaged their homes. Others have left creditors unpaid. Others stint in ways that do them harm. Christians have given up their pews, and their church, to spend their money and their Sundays automobiling.

Moreover, most automobilists are law-breakers in the matter of speed; who, were there no automobiles, would be law-abiding citizens. This lawlessness sometimes results in injury, sometimes in death, to themselves and those with them; or to others using the highways on their lawful occasions;—not to speak of the property loss. The toll of injury, loss, and death from automobiles is a scandal.

Reckless chauffeurs, again, are a new and formidable terror to the wayfarer; they would probably be unoffending mechanics, were it not for automobiles.

It is a debatable question whether pleasure automobiles have not done more harm than good.

Does St. Paul, then, require the strong brother, who can use his liberty without abusing it, to forego or discard his car, because of the weak brother? Must he and his family forego the beauty of the country, the fresh air, the zest of appetite, the general exhilaration of these "spins", because one weak brother may be made covetous, another extravagant, another reckless of life and limb, misusing his example? Neither St. Paul, nor

the church, nor the good sense of men would say so.

Becoming clothes, too, have been the undoing of many, both men and women. Here is a source of unhappiness more prolific than several that loom up larger. It forms a considerable item in the high cost of living. Because of it many consume their days in vanity, their days and their dollars. It could be removed wholly, or largely, if those who are strong to set the tone of society, —if church members,—should resolve, *"If fashionable clothing causeth my brother to stumble, I will wear no fashionable clothing, while the world standeth, that I cause not my brother to stumble"; "It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to wear fashionable clothing, whereby thy brother stumbleth"*. Instead, the strong brethren might wear, while the world standeth, a sober and unchanging garb, like the Dunkards', which would meet the requirements of decency and protection far better than our present modish cuts.

Must we do it? We ought to avoid extremes and extravagance; we ought to consider the influence of our example; but must we, to be good Christians, eschew beauty and charm in our clothing,—or even fashion altogether?

Tea and coffee are drunk in excess by multitudes. So taken, they injure the nerves, the digestion, the heart. Many people are as complete slaves to their tea and coffee as the toper to his whiskey, and physicians are attaching much importance to the ravages of this sort of intemperance. Now these tea and coffee victims are surely

"weak brethren". Were it not for the example of their strong brethren, misused, they might never have contracted the habit; and were it not for that example today, they might indulge their appetite less freely and frequently; or at least they would not justify themselves as they do. If the moderate users became abstainers, on the principle, *"If tea and coffee cause my brother to stumble, I will drink no tea or coffee while the world standeth, that I cause not my brother to stumble"*, there would, surely, be less excess and suffering in this kind. Must we, then, as Christians, quit tea and coffee? Certainly not. The Pauline principle applies in this field, but not to that length. The Pauline principle is not rigorism; it is kindly common-sense.

And so of tobacco. Many are slaves to it, to the injury of body and mind. Was Phillips Brooks, then, in smoking his big black cigars, from which he got so much pleasure and no harm, doing an unchristian thing? Some weak brethren, it is true, men and boys, may have been encouraged to excess by a misuse of his example. In their presence, if he knew their weakness, he would have abstained. Was anything further required by the Christian law of charity? Did St. Paul really mean, "I will not use any pleasant thing that another may abuse"? He did not follow this rule himself, nor did he enjoin it on others; and Christianity could never have made its triumphal progress, had it so affronted the universal reason of men. Even professed ascetics have not gone that far: they denied, they mortified, themselves;

they did not force their denials and mortifications on others.

Everything lawful may be abused,—speech, ice-water, religion. If men held their tongue, or confined themselves to necessary utterance, much mischief would be avoided. If we drank no ice-water, nobody would suffer from the ice-water habit. If I prefer my religion with a rich ritual, a weak brother, seeing me, may abuse that ritual by making it a substitute for the weightier matters of the law. Am I debarred, then, from the worship I prefer? If we are to surrender everything, however lawful, that another may find a pretext in our example for abusing, life will be reduced to mere necessary elements, a calamitous impoverishment. The weakling will rule the world. Temperance will disappear. As Tertullian believed "because it was absurd", we should choose because it was unpleasant; for things pleasant are more liable to abuse than things not so pleasant; no one is so apt to go to excess on hard-tack as on porter-house; on tepid water as on beer. It may be true that, if we all lived on hard-tack and tepid water, we should be healthier,—healthier, yet not so happy. How many would care for such a bare, joyless life? A philosopher here and there; occasionally a religious devotee. But, for most, it is the things we do not need that make life attractive. That everyone should consider the effect of his example is recognized. That everyone should abate of his own freedom, when others might be led astray through it, is a duty. It is also true that those in conspicuous

place are under special obligations to guard their walk and conversation. Yet even this obligation has its limits; even prominent people have some rights, even as against the whole multitude of weaklings.

The strong brother must consider the weak; but how, and how far, is for him to say and no one else. It is a matter between him and his God; and the decision he comes to is not subject to any one's review. Two Christians, equally conscientious, might take different views of their duty in the same situation. In these fine arbitraments of judgment and conscience no outsider who was wise would wish to intrude. Outside the common moralities, it is a serious thing to tell a man what his duty is.

To the rigorist's rule, "Touch not, taste not, handle not", we oppose, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof"; "the earth hath he given to the children of men". The "meat" that St. Paul spoke of was not merely flesh food; it was pagan poetry and art, the theatre, dancing, secular music, entertainments, games, good clothes, jewelry. It is these today too, plus cards, billiards, baseball, tobacco, automobiles, aeroplanes, Thanksgiving and Christmas dinners.

Paul's meaning is that, if I have knowledge of some weak brother who may go wrong because I indulge myself, I ought to forego the indulgence. I am obliged to this self-sacrifice, however, not by a vague danger, but by a pretty definite knowledge. If a man unable to control his appetite for drink were among my dinner guests, I ought not to serve

drink. I ought to omit either the man or the drink. But not both. It is unreasonable to demand that I exclude drink from my table, simply because some weak brother who is not there may hear that wine was served and make it a pretext to go off on a spree. My conduct surely must not be governed by his bad logic. It would be a topsy-turvy world, if it were subject to such disordered reasoning as the following: "As long as the Latin races drink, we Germanic peoples will get drunk. Therefore the Latin races must stop drinking". Paul's robust sense would have made short work of such inconsequence. The principle is not: "A get drunks; therefore B must not drink"; but, "A gets drunk; therefore A must not drink, and B must not drink when A is around".

Nor do we need proof that no member of the company is weak. We have a right to assume it, unless it be a large and miscellaneous gathering, which will probably have some of this type. Even here the occasion and the company have their claims. One weak brother has no right to interfere with the enjoyment of a dozen or a hundred reasonable people, when he can just as well keep away. The banquet he is invited to is a fortnight distant, three miles off. He knows that drink will be served there. What compulsion is he under to go? He should decline. He will lose the enjoyment of meeting friends and chums; but this is only a just penalty of his weakness. Somebody has to suffer for his weakness, if he is to stay sober. Why not he rather than the hundred banqueters? Why should he, or his advocates,

ask society to deny its safe, lawful, and customary indulgences, that is, to suffer all the deprivations of the weak brother, in order that the weak brother may suffer none?

As a German theologian, Eichhorn (I think it was), said: "We must not use our liberty recklessly: yet renunciation is not unlimited. If it were, it would confirm the weak in their mistake; the strong would be hindered in their progress, and the truth denied. The requirement that we should accommodate ourselves to the weak must therefore be combined with this,—we must lead the weak to truth and strength. Our rule must be accommodation with correction; to consider the weak, but not to allow ourselves to be placed by them under any law of thraldom. Under all conditions we should maintain the law of evangelical liberty. Every attempt, therefore, to stamp the merely individual as the universal and generally obligatory should be protested against, and the individual must be kept within its proper limits. Delicate situations must be met, not by rules leading to endless discussions, but by immediate tact and the power of personality".

This, too, is the view taken of St. Paul's teaching by the editors of the volume on 1 Corinthians, in the International Critical Commentary,—the Rt. Rev. Archibald Robertson, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Exeter, and the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D., late Master of University College, Durham; on the verse, "If food causes my brother to stumble, I will certainly never eat flesh again for evermore, that I may not make my brother to stumble" (1

Cor. 8.13):—"The declaration is conditional. If the Apostle knows of definite cases in which his eating food will lead to others being encouraged to violate the dictates of conscience, then certainly he will never eat meat so long as there is real danger of this (10.28, 29). But, if he knows of no such danger, he will use his Christian freedom and eat without scruple (10.25-27). He does not of course mean that the whole practice of Christians is to be regulated with a view to the possible scrupulousness of the narrow-minded. That would be to sacrifice our divinely given liberty (2 Cor. 3.17) to the ignorant prejudices of bigots. The circumstances of this or that Christian may be such that it is his duty to abstain from intoxicants, although he is never tempted to drink to excess; but Christians in general are bound by no such rule, and it would be tyranny to try to impose such a rule".

And I add, Has the church a right to confess itself vanquished by any lawful appetite? Is it not its duty to show that it is master of all, by saying to every one of them, *Thus far, and no farther?* The church's credit is not in retreat, but in conquest. It is proper for the weak brother to say, "I must let this alone, because it is too strong for me". But it would be a humiliation and an abdication for the Christian fellowship to say that. There is a moral majesty in abstaining wholly from wrong. There is also an equal moral majesty in moving freely among the lawful appetites, passions, pleasures, using all, mastered by none. Surely this is a valuable element in the

Christian ideal, this noble temperance, this just self-control; and the church would be poor indeed without it.

The weak brother may find it profitable to cut off arm or leg, even to pluck out his eye, and cast them from him, if they cause him to offend. But the rest of us are not obliged to this self-mutilation in order to make him feel comfortable. A Christendom made up of one-legged, one-armed, one-eyed people would be far inferior even to our present imperfect order. Our Maker gave us two legs, two arms, two eyes, because he wished us to have and use and rejoice in them. If, then, we are bid do or believe something that revolts our conscience and intelligence, other considerations, for the nonce, may have stronger claims than the weak brother. The sincere believer is told that the Bible condemns wine and "strong drink". He knows better. He is told that the wine into which Jesus converted water, at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, and over which the experienced master of the feast waxed so eulogistic, was only unfermented grape-juice. Knowing his Bible, he listens with impatience. He is told that drink is the one prolific source of vice, crime, unhappiness, and poverty. Knowing something of Mohammedan societies, of Latin Christendom, and of human nature, he laughs. And on these and such grounds he is bid let drink alone!

Is it not his duty, rather, to vindicate Christian liberty and Christian truth? That liberty and truth were purchased at too costly a price to let them go, by default, from any consideration

whatever. They have been given us, not to surrender, but to defend and propagate. For the nonce, the weak brother must look out for himself.

The Pauline view is that we must proclaim our freedom, from all these rigorist prohibitions, whether dealing with wine, meat, marriage, days and times and seasons,—in a word, from all teetotal views,—as part of the Gospel message; just as the same Apostle preached freedom from circumcision and Sabbath observance. The Gospel was the doing away of all these restrictions, not their continuance, and not the substitution of a new set for the old. The rigorist's view is the contradiction of all this. He works to make this bondage to legalism tighter, and ever tighter, until finally every vestige of liberty be taken from us. That is, the rigorists put forward as the ideal they seek to establish the very thing St. Paul sought to abolish. The very bondage Christ died to free us from they would again make us slaves to. Legalism crucified him before. These New Legalists would crucify him afresh and put him to open shame by blaspheming the liberty he won for us. The issue is a vital one. It might today almost be described as *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae,* because the Christ-spirit tends one way, —to free us from sabbatarianism, teetotalism, and other legalisms,—while rigorism, or New Legalism, seeks to impose these chains afresh. The typical and symbolic miracle of modern rigorism would be the turning of wine into water.

Martin Luther, while recognizing the disciplinary value of Sunday as a sacred day, and

also the duty of conforming with the well-settled customs of the Christian society, denied that the day had any divine authorization, and fiercely denounced the effort to establish it on such a foundation. "If anywhere", he says, "the day is made holy for the mere day's sake,—if anywhere one sets up its observance on a Jewish foundation, then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall remove this encroachment on Christian liberty" (Luther's "Table Talk"). If they had dared to tell him that he must not drink, because wine was unscriptural and sinful, we can hear that robustious peasant-prophet shouting his orders, "Drink in their faces".

If the rigorist view of the Pauline principle were correct, the distinction between things that are required and things that are only lawful would disappear. Since every one of these "lawful" things may be the undoing of a weak brother, the rigorist rule would place them all under the ban. Everything would then be either commanded or forbidden, positively required or positively excluded. The only function of judgment would be the determination between right and wrong, never the discrimination between the wise and unwise, or between the wise and less wise. But not even the rigorist could order his days along lines so hard and fast. The larger part of our moral judgments is, in fact, occupied with interests that are permissible, lawful, right, but not necessary; that may be admitted or shut out; that may be admitted in part and shut out in part; that may

be admitted today and shut out tomorrow,—on considerations of expediency, without moral offence.

In justice to the weak brother, it ought to be added that it is not he who is prone to make unreasonable demands. As a rule, he quite recognizes the right of other people to attend to their own affairs, even while lamenting his inability to attend to his own. The situation commonly is that a number of noisy brothers thrust themselves, unasked, into the case, as the weak brother's nearest friends. He has not appointed them his guardians, and may resent their proprietorship in him and his welfare. No matter. They take command of the situation, and dispense their bulls and anathemas on all sides. It is not the weak brother who is unreasonable, who is unscriptural, who is dictatorial; it is these strong brothers,—strong, but mistaken.

In considering the Pauline rule, wine cannot be taken out of the large class to which it belongs, the class of lawful things that may or may not be expedient. To make a special rule for wine (or like beverages) is unwarranted. There is nothing about it or them to require a separate classification or treatment,—unless it be that they have scriptural and divine sanction that most others have not. They have their use; they are liable to abuse; in using them we must be considerate of others; we must not judge another whose practice differs from ours,—to his own Master he standeth or falleth; the renunciation that we owe to the weak brother has its limits; human nature, as the

Creator made it, has its rights; concession must not go to the point of erecting our brother's weakness into a principle of truth or a norm of practice; and the general aim must be to infuse strength, not to coddle weakness;—this is the Pauline principle;—which is not rigor, extravagance, impossibilism, but just kindly commonsense.

We are not discussing the duty of the state in this field. The modern state is not a theocracy, and its lines seldom coincide with those prescribed by the Bible and church for the conscience. It may allow things that our religion does not allow. It may forbid things that our religion does not forbid. There need be conflict only when the state commands or forbids what our religion forbids or commands.

In that regrettable situation the Christian's course is clear. For example, if the state forbade the use of fermented wine in the Holy Communion, we would disregard it; we would do as our Lord told us to do,—"All of you, drink of this",—if we had to go to jail for it. Fortunately, however, the two fields are so removed, for the most part, that interference is unlikely. Any Christian may follow his conscience and obey the laws, both.

III

Beside the witness of the Gospel and of St. Paul, we have a decree of the first Council of the Christian Church that has a bearing on the matter.

The Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15.28) declared that the Holy Ghost and the Council laid no greater burden on the Gentile converts than to abstain from things offered to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from fornication,—the first three being temporary, and the last alone of permanent obligation. Now there was more or less drunkenness among these Gentiles, as we have seen. Yet the Apostolic Church, guided, as it declares, by the Holy Spirit, holds it to be unwise to impose anything further than the above.

The numerous passages of Scripture already cited sufficiently show the abhorrence in which it holds the sin of intemperance. Not even in the earliest stages of Revelation, with so much in conduct and character that was rough-and-ready, and destined to be outgrown, was this particular sin palliated. Naturally it is not dwelt on so insistently as later; but yet it is marked for a sin as patently as falsehood or robbery: recall the story of Noah's drunkenness. And, as the sacred record proceeds, so does the reprobation of drunkenness: there is scarce a prophet that does not denounce it.

The New Testament over and over again pronounces the curse of God on this evil. "Take heed", said Jesus (Luke 21.34), ". . . lest haply your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness"; "But, if that servant shall say in his heart, 'My lord delayeth his coming'; and shall begin to beat the men-servants and the maid-servants, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; the lord of that servant shall come

. . . and shall cut him asunder, and appoint his portion with the unfaithful'' (Luke 12.45-46).

St. Paul (1 Cor. 6.10) associates drunkards with abandoned and criminal characters, and declares that none of them ''shall inherit the kingdom of God''. Likewise the book of the Revelation (22.15) excludes them, along with murderers, fornicators, and liars, from the holy city.

PART TWO

THE CHURCH

CHAPTER I

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

I

By "PRIMITIVE" I mean the first century or so following the New Testament record. The data for this period are so scant that we could not tell from them whether during it Christians drank fermented wine freely or not. But they were drinking it freely when we saw them last. They are drinking it freely when we catch sight of them again. Now, if they were drinking before, and drinking after, the chances are they were drinking between.

However, let us now examine the few available data for this obscure period. First, however, here is something remarkable.—Justin Martyr's first Apology, about 140 A. D., describing the celebration of the Eucharist, says, "Then there is presented to the brethren bread and a cup of water. . . . When the president has given thanks . . . the deacons distribute to each of those present . . . the bread and the water, . . . and they carry portions away to those not present" (Chap. 65). At least, this is the reading preferred by some of the best scholars today, such as

Prof. Harnack and Dr. Frederick C. Conybeare. If it is correct, then the churches for which Justin spoke used neither wine nor grape-juice in the Eucharist, but water! "Justin was a Roman, but may not represent the official Roman Church".

"Tatian, the pupil of Justin, used water in place of wine in the Holy Communion. The Marcionites, the Ebionites, the Montanists of Phrygia, Africa, and Galatia, also the confessor Alcibiades of Lyons, A. D. 177, did the same. Cyprian avers that his predecessors on the throne of Carthage had used water, and that many African bishops continued to do so, "out of ignorance", he says, "and simple-mindedness, and God would forgive them". Pionius, the Catholic martyr of Smyrna, A. D. 250, also used water. A heretical writing, *the Acts of Thomas,* about 200 A. D., has water, not wine, in the Holy Communion. Also there was an ancient Jewish monastic order, the Therapeutae, who used only bread and water in their holy repast. Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea (died 340 A. D.), and a notable church historian, found this no bar to a theory that the Therapeutae were the first converts of St. Mark. In fact, there is so much about the use of water in the Eucharist, in the early church, that the famous German theologian, Prof. Harnack, says (History of Dogma, vol. I, page 212, foot-note), "I have shown that in the different Christian circles of the second century, water, and only water, was often used in the Supper, instead of wine, and that in many regions this custom was maintained up to the middle of the third century

(See Cyprian, Ep. 63). I have endeavored to make it further probable that even Justin in his Apology describes a celebration of the Lord's Supper with bread and water".

On the other hand, all this evidence, and more, with Harnack's entire argument, has been traversed by Scheiwiler, in his "Die Elemente der Eucharistie", pages 176 and following, with quite a contrary conclusion. Scheiwiler maintains, as the result of an exhaustive examination, that, beyond individual extravagances and eccentricities, no other beverage than wine was ever used or recognized authoritatively by the church.

However this may be, everybody admits that the use of water for wine in the Lord's Supper was a departure from the example of Jesus and of the Apostolic church. The reason for this unauthorized substitution is not indicated; but it is safe to say that it was a concession to the asceticism not uncommon at the time, throughout the Roman world; which to a certain extent had infected even the Church.

But it never became the rule: the most that Prof. Harnack claims for it is equal, or almost equal, vogue for a time. The Church as a whole did not succumb to this aberration; nor did the leading portions of the church. The Church of this period never ceased to carry on the sound tradition of this sacrament, transmitted by Apostles and Apostolic Christians, and enshrined in the Gospels. The *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,* within this period, in its prayer "Concerning the Cup", says, "We give thanks to thee, our Father,

for the holy vine of David thy servant, which thou didst make known to us through Jesus thy servant'',—language not applicable to water.

To this primitive period also belongs evidence from the Catacombs. A frequent representation on their walls is the Eucharist; in which the faithful recline at tables, with baskets of bread, and with bottles, presumably, of wine.

An inscription of a bishop named Abercius, of Hierapolis, 160 A. D., dealing with the Eucharist, ends with these words, ''having good wine and giving the mixt cup with bread''. Abercius and Irenaeus are the first to speak of wine mixed with water in the Eucharist.

Tertullian, 200 A. D., tells how scrupulous the priests were lest a crumb of the bread or ''a drop of the wine'' should fall on the ground, and thus Christ's body be trampled on and otherwise profaned (See, for above facts, Ency. Brit., 11th Edition, ''Eucharist'').

The Church, as a whole, or in large part, then, was faithful to the tradition of Christ; and it was only in the days of her weakness, when she was struggling for existence, that she tolerated a departure from it. Jesus used wine; the church used it. Jesus used fermented wine; the church used it. As soon as the church was in a position to assert herself, she rebuked the rigorism that itself rebuked, and set itself above, its Master: *It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord* (Mat. 10.25). This asceticism was one of the Church's most

troublesome and persistent foes. Let us examine it.

II

Asceticism.—As far back as history, and probably as far back as humanity, men denied and tortured their bodies, to procure favor from the higher powers. In civilized times great waves of this asceticism have arisen and swept over countries and races, forming more or less lasting cults. Pythagoras started such a movement over five hundred years before Christ; and, shortly after, Buddha preached his famous Gospel of renunciation. Both these teachers, and all the great ascetics, taught that "the body is the tomb of the soul".

When Christianity came, society was everywhere permeated by these cults. Among the Jews were the Therapeutae and the Essenes, who followed a monastic system, living in poverty, chastity, and fasting. Christianity found asceticism at every turn, among Gentiles as among Jews; and was much troubled by it. On the one hand, ascetics were drawn to the Church by its pure morals; on the other, they objected to the honor and the privileges it accorded to the body and its normal instincts, and they felt they had a mission to improve, in this direction, on the Gospel. St. Paul hotly denounced these rigorists in the Church, *forbidding to marry and* commanding *to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and know the truth. For every creature of God*

is good, and nothing is to be rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer (1 Tim. 4.3-4). This doctrine of St. Paul was a bitter pill to the ascetics. In their creed, what was pleasant and what was right were contraries. That a thing was pleasant was enough to damn it. The origin of the wide-spread aversion to these "creatures of God", indeed, went back to prehistoric times, to the savage conception of tabu. This superstition had largely, though not altogether, died out among civilized peoples; but not so the observances that had originated in it. These persisted as habits, and new reasons were found for them; and these new reasons systematized, and thus multiplied, the original prohibitions. Tabu, for example, applied to the flesh of but few animals; but ascetics refrained from all meat, on the new ground that every animal had a spirit, and that to eat flesh was to incorporate in oneself this inferior and irrational soul; or on the ground that human souls at death often passed into the bodies of animals, and that to eat the animal was, therefore, to eat a human being,—perhaps even a dear friend or relative; or on the ground that the act of begetting is unclean, and its offspring always unclean, and that men ought not to add this uncleanness of animals to their own native uncleanness.

Marriage likewise fell under the ban, on various grounds.

Wine was thought to have a soul or spirit by which intoxication was caused,—"the demon

rum", and this inferior soul must not be admitted into union with the human soul.

These were the three great tabus common to almost all ascetics,—meat, marriage, wine; to which each cult added its particular tabus,—as the Pythagoreans, beans. Against these three were directed the fiercest assaults. These three, —wine, women, meat,—were, to ascetics, the fountain-heads of evil, the poison of the spirit's life, the deadly trinity, the insurmountable barriers to God, the ministers of animality, decay, and death.

Now nothing is more original about the Gospel, as first preached, than that Christ's pregnant revival and fortification of religion was, both by example and precept, not only free from these asceticisms, but hostile to them. The Gospel recognized all the natural institutions of society and the natural instincts of the body, and bestowed its blessing on them; they are good gifts of God, for useful service, for innocent enjoyment,—in their own place, in due measure. Jesus drank wine. Jesus ate meat. Jesus did not marry, but "he adorned and beautified with his presence and first miracle" the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. Jesus was no ascetic; he endured, rather, the lying reproach of a glutton and a wine-bibber (Mat. 11.19; Luke 7.34). If Jesus, like John the Baptist, had not drunk wine, they could not have called him a wine-bibber. He knew it. And, knowing it, he drank wine. If he had fasted, like John and his disciples, they could not have called him a glutton. He knew it. And, knowing it, he

fasted not, nor his disciples; but ate and enjoyed the food that was set before him. Evil men might misrepresent his example; weak men might abuse it, to their own undoing. But Jesus lived and moved and wrought, a man among men, the norm and measure of a man while the world endures. That sweet reasonableness of his, that beautiful moderation, that perfect sanity, that delicate and sensitive adjustment of conflicting appeals from within and from without, avoiding "the falsehood of extremes", have ever been the stumbling block of the fanatic and the puzzle of the weak in faith; but unto them that are exercised thereby "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 1.24). And note that it is this ideal that weathers the ages. As Joubert says (quoted by Matthew Arnold, Essays in Criticisms, I. 289), "The austere sects excite the most enthusiasm at first; but the temperate sects have always been the most durable".

These early ascetics in and about the church had many divisions and many names. Those in the church were comprehensively termed Encratites, meaning the Continent, or Temperance People. The Encratites that made much of using water instead of wine in the Lord's Supper were specifically known as Aquarians, Watermen. Now these Encratites were not content with being tolerated, but aspired to make the Church over on their own narrow unscriptural lines. Had they succeeded, it would have been reduced to a fanatical sect, to perish, like all the rest. But, when the Church had taken their measure, and seen its own

peril, it set its face uncompromisingly against them. Some of its polemical measures, sad to say, savored of the cruel spirit of the times rather than of the Gospel. Such was the Code of Theodosius (382 A. D.), which made Aquarians liable to death. In extenuation we should remember, not only the age, but also the fact that the Church had been fighting for its life against them of its own household. In all conscience, it had made generous enough concessions to ascetic principle and practice,—far too generous,—in the place and honor it accorded to the monastic life. Any ascetic was welcome to practice his vocation, under the benediction of the Church,—yes, and with double honor,—as long as he used this liberty in subjection to the Church and in deference to its larger liberty, not making his way an ultimatum of salvation for others.

Through this long and bitter conflict the Church vindicated the human body as a temple of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. 6.19), having its rights and its honor; whose lawful privileges included even sensuous gratifications, in their measure and place. Wine, meat, and marriage were vindicated as good gifts of God, for man's use and enjoyment, to be received in gratitude and loyalty to Him whose creatures they are.

CHAPTER II

THE FATHERS

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, Saint and Martyr, before 200 A. D. He had known men who had known St. John.—"Therefore do these men [Ebionite heretics] reject the commixture of the heavenly wine [in allusion to the mixture of water in the eucharistic cup, as practised in those primitive times], and wish it to be of water of the world only, not receiving God, so as to have union with him".—Irenaeus against Heresies, Book V. 1.3.

Clement of Alexandria, earliest of the Greek Fathers, wrote a work called The Instructor, in which he discusses practical problems of the Christian's life. Chapter II. of Book II. is "On Drinking", and the following extracts will show how this early witness of the faith, who was born about 150 A. D., regarded this matter:

"The natural, temperate, and necessary beverage, therefore, for the thirsty is water.

"I therefore admire those who have adopted an austere life, and who are fond of water, the medicine of temperance, and flee as far as possible from wine, shunning it as they would the danger of fire.

"But towards evening, about supper-time, wine may be used, when we are no longer engaged in more serious readings. Then also the air becomes

colder than it is during the day; so that the falling temperature requires to be nourished by the introduction of heat. . . . Those who are already advanced in life may partake more cheerfully of the draught, to warm by the harmless medicine of the vine the chill of age. For old men's passions are not, for the most part, stirred to such agitation as to drive them to the shipwreck of drunkenness. . . . But to them also let the limit of their potations be the point up to which they keep their reason unwavering, their memory active, and their body unmoved and unshaken by wine.

"It has therefore been well said, 'A joy of the soul and heart was wine created from the beginning, when drunk in moderate sufficiency'. And it is best to mix the wine with as much water as possible. . . . For both are works of God, and so the mixture of both, of water and of wine, conduces together to health, because life consists of what is necessary and what is useful [necessities and luxuries]. With water, then, which is the necessary of life, and to be used in abundance, there is also to be mixed the useful. . . .

"With reason, therefore, our Instructor, in his solicitude for our salvation, forbids us, 'Drink not wine to drunkenness'. . . .

"For if he [Christ] made water wine at the marriage, he did not give permission to get drunk. . . .

"It is agreeable, therefore, to right reason, to drink on account of the cold of winter . . .; and on other occasions as a medicine for the intestines.

. . . We must not therefore trouble ourselves to procure [here follows a long list of imported costly wines]. For the temperate drinker one wine suffices, the product of the cultivation of the one God. For why should not the wine of their own country satisfy men's desires, unless they were to import water also, like the foolish Persian kings? . . .

"Haste in drinking is a practice injurious to the partaker. Do not haste to mischief, my friend. Your drink is not being taken from you. It is yours, and it will wait for you. . . .

"In what manner do you think the Lord drank, when he became man for our sakes? Was it not with decorum and propriety? Was it not deliberately? For rest assured he also himself partook of wine; for he too was man. And he blessed the wine, saying, 'Take, drink: this is my blood', . . . the blood of the vine. And that he who drinks ought to observe moderation he clearly showed by what he taught at feasts. For he did not teach, affected by wine. And that it was wine which was the thing blessed, he showed again, when he said to his disciples, 'I will not drink of the fruit of this vine, till I drink it with you in the kingdom of my Father'. But that it was wine which was drunk by the Lord, he tells us again, when he spake concerning himself, . . . 'For the son of man', he says, 'came, and they say, Behold, a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans'. Let this be held fast by us against those that are called Encratites" [total abstainers who condemned wine].

Then Clement tells how the women affected drinking from a special cup with a dainty narrow mouth, which obliged them to throw their heads back, exposing their necks. But even so, Clement says, "We have not prohibited drinking from alabastra" [the aforesaid cups]. All he asked was that women be careful, and not excite remark or attention, in their public drinking.

In the same chapter he alludes to the use of wine in the Eucharist: "As wine is mixed with water, so is the Spirit with man. And the one, the mixture of wine and water, nourishes to faith; while the other, the Spirit, conducts to immortality".

Clement's position, then, amounts to this,—wine is a good gift of our kind Father. It should be used temperately; some do better to abstain from it altogether.

And one circumstance in these utterances,—all of them, be it remembered, in the same discourse,—is noteworthy, for it illustrates a literary habit of the ancients, of importance in our study of their attitude to wine. Clement commends those who shun wine as they would fire. This looks like an unqualified condemnation, and in a modern writer it would be so. But not in Clement; for only a few minutes later he is praising wine as "a joy of the heart and soul", "a work of God" equally with water, "conducive to health", as both drunk and blessed by Christ; and he condemns "those that are called Encratites" for condemning wine. The point is here: the ancients often expressed themselves absolutely, when they

intended their utterance to be understood with a qualification. Sometimes the qualification follows after an interval; sometimes it is left to the good sense of the reader.

Cyprian of Carthage, Bishop, Saint, Martyr (200-258 A. D.).—In his 62nd Epistle, he condemns those who used water for wine in the Eucharist; and the alcoholic nature of this wine he makes unmistakable.

"Nothing must be done by us but what the Lord first did on our behalf, as that the cup which is offered in remembrance of him should be offered mingled with wine."

"The Lord offered bread and the cup mixed with wine."

"Whence it appears that the blood of Christ is not offered, if there be no wine in the cup".

"The Holy Spirit also is not silent in the Psalms on the sacrament of this thing, when he makes mention of the Lord's cup and says (Ps. 23.5), 'Thy inebriating cup, how excellent it is!' Now the cup which inebriates is surely mingled with wine, for water cannot inebriate anybody."

"But how perverse and contrary it is that, although the Lord at the marriage made wine of water, we should make water of wine!"

The Apostolical Constitutions are a collection of ecclesiastical regulations in eight books, the last of which concludes with the eighty-five "Canons of the Holy Apostles". The Constitutions were a spurious compilation, ascribed to the Apostles, but put together in the 4th century. Yet they are valuable as a record of the order, dis-

cipline, and views of the Church at the time, and some of their regulations go back to a very early date indeed.

Number 44, of Book VIII., is "Concerning Drunkards". When invited to the memorials of the faithful departed, this Constitution warns presbyters and deacons to be sober: "We say this, not that they are not to drink at all, otherwise it would be to the reproach of what God has made for cheerfulness, but that they be not disordered with wine. For the Scripture does not say, 'Do not drink wine'; but what says it? 'Drink not wine to drunkenness'; and again, 'Thorns spring up in the hand of the drunkard'. Nor do we say this only to those of the clergy, but also to every lay Christian, upon whom the name of our Lord Jesus Christ is called. For to them also it is said, 'Who hath woe? Who hath sorrow? Who hath uneasiness? Who hath babbling? Who hath red eyes? Who hath wounds without cause? Do not these things belong to those that tarry long at the wine, and that go to seek where drinking-meetings are?' "

Number 53 of the Apostolical Canons reads: "If any bishop, presbyter, or deacon does not on festival days partake of flesh or wine, from an abhorrence of them [that is, from conscientious scruples], and not out of religious restraint, let him be deposed, as being seared in his own conscience, and being the cause of offence to many."

Athanasius the Great, Father of Orthodoxy, Bishop, Saint, and first of the four great Greek Doctors; 293-373 A. D.—

In his History of the Arians (Part II. 13), he relates with horror the cruelty of Gregory, his rival in the see of Alexandria, in that "when the widows and other mendicants had received alms, he commanded what had been given them to be taken away, and the vessels in which they carried their oil and wine to be broken". Wine, then, was a part of the provision that the Church bestowed on its indigent.

Basil, the Great, Bishop, Saint, one of the four great Greek Doctors; 330-379 A. D.—

"Their heresy is, as it were, an offshoot of the Marcionites, abominating, as they do, marriage, refusing wine, and calling God's creature [wine] polluted" (Letter 99.47).

An entire Homily of Basil's, No. XIV., of those on moral topics, is directed against drunkards. With all allowance for exaggeration on the part of the pulpit orator, the scenes described in this Homily, and here and there throughout patristic literature, indicate that drunkenness was much more prevalent throughout Greek and Latin society in those centuries than it is in any country of Christendom today. The Church's tolerance of drinking, yes, its praise of wine when used in moderation, was in the face of a provocation to extreme language and extreme measures such as we find nowhere now. But, with all this temptation to extremes, the Church never failed to make the distinction between the use and abuse of drink, praising the one as cordially as it condemned the other.

This "Homily against Drunkards" tells how on

Easter Day certain wanton women of Caesarea started dancing, and singing indecent songs, and drinking, in the Basilica (or Church) of the Martyrs, and urged the young men to join them in this profanation of a holy place and a holy day. Too many accepted their invitation, among them even men of high rank: "Sorrowful sight for Christian eyes! A man in the prime of life, of powerful frame [everybody in the congregation must have recognized the description], of high rank in the army, is carried furtively home, because he cannot stand up and use his feet. A man who ought to be a terror to our enemies is a laughing-stock to the lads in the streets. He is smitten down by no sword,—slain by no foe. A military man in the bloom of manhood, the prey of wine, and ready to suffer any fate his foes may choose! Drunkenness is the ruin of reason; —it is premature old age; it is temporary death.

"What are drunkards but the idols of the heathen, since they have eyes and see not, and ears and hear not?"

Can we imagine today a lascivious and drunken debauch of abandoned women, participated in, not only by gilded youth, but by men high in the Government and in business, on an Easter morning, in or about a parish church? It is unthinkable. Yet that is what happened in Caesarea, in Basil's Day.

For all that, in this same Homily, Basil, in the very torrent of his wrath, observes a just discrimination. "Wine", he says, "the gift of God to the sober for the relief of their infirmity, has

now been made an instrument of lasciviousness to the intemperate. . . . As water is the foe of fire, so too much wine extinguishes the reason.'' It is not wine that is at fault; it is the ''too much''.

Ambrose, Saint, Bishop, and one of the four Great Latin Doctors, 340-397 A. D.—

This Saint dissuades from wine, and recommends water. He declares that the ''divine law—in the very beginning—gave the springs for drink.—After the Flood, the just man found wine a source of temptation to him. Let us then use the natural drink of temperance, and would that we all were able to do so''. Yet, even so, he admits wine: ''Because we are not all strong, the Apostle says, 'Use a little wine, because of thy frequent infirmities'.'' Then he goes on to enumerate the ancient worthies, like Daniel and Judith, who on special occasions nourished their resolution on water, not wine. This is in Letter LXIII., 27, 28. It is not alone abstinence from wine that St. Ambrose is recommending, but also rigorous fasting. Elsewhere he speaks of our Lord's converting water into wine; also he used the mixed chalice in the Eucharist; so that we must look on his recommendation of water as a beverage as a counsel of perfection. This is the more probable from the way he speaks of the same subject in his ''Duties of the Clergy'', Book I., Chapter 20. He there advises, not commands, the clergy ''to avoid the banquets of strangers'', because they ''engross one's attention, and soon produce a love of feasting. . . . One's glass, too, even against

one's will, is filled time after time. . . . When one rises sober [at home], at any rate one's presence need not be condemned by the insolence of another". This is not the way a man speaks who thinks that even the first glass is a sin.

Jerome, Saint, one of the four Great Latin Doctors, author of the Vulgate; 340-420 A. D.—

In his XXII. Letter, on a state of virginity, he savagely condemns wine, urging the virgin, the spouse of Christ, to avoid it as she would poison (Section 8). This is an expression of Jerome's fanatical asceticism, which, three paragraphs later, declares, "A rumbling and empty stomach and fevered lungs . . . are indispensable as means to the preservation of chastity"; and in the 17th advises the virgin, "Let your companions be women pale and thin with fasting". Thirty years later Jerome wrote another letter, No. CXXX., on the same subject, which is much milder. The asceticism recommended is not so severe. There is nothing about the virtue of "a rumbling, empty stomach and fevered lungs", nor about choosing companions "pale and thin with fasting". Nor is there a single word against wine. Years had taught the writer moderation.

Chrysostom, the greatest preacher in the history of Christianity; Bishop, Saint, Martyr (virtually); one of the Four Great Greek Doctors; 347-407 A. D.—

Chrysostom, too, exalted and practised the ascetic element in religion. Yet, he says,—

"Shun excess and drunkenness and gluttony. For God gave meat and drink, not for excess, but

for nourishment. For it is not the wine that produces drunkenness; for, if that were the case, everybody would needs be drunken''.—St. Chrysostom, Homily XX. on Second Corinthians.

Note those last words,—''everybody would needs be drunken''; for they show that the drinking of alcoholic wine was universal, with no censure from Chrysostom.

''Not that to drink wine is shameful. God forbid! For such precepts belong to heretics''.—St. Chrysostom, Concerning the Statues, Homily 1.7.

''Timothy had overthrown the strength of his stomach by fasting and water-drinking. Paul, having said before, 'Drink no longer water', then brings forward his counsel as to the drinking of wine''.—Concerning the Statues, Homily 1.8.

''For wine was given us by God, not that we might be drunken, but that we might be sober. . . . It is the best medicine, when it has the best moderation to direct it. The passage before us [Paul's advice to Timothy to 'drink a little wine'] is useful also against heretics, who speak evil of God's creatures; for, if it [wine] had been among the number of things forbidden, Paul would not have permitted it, nor would have said it was to be used. And not only against the heretics, but against the simple ones among our brethren, who, when they see any persons disgracing themselves from drunkenness, instead of reproving such, blame the fruit given them by God, and say, 'Let there be no wine'. We should say then in answer to such, 'Let there be no

drunkenness; for wine is the work of God, but drunkenness is the work of the devil. Wine makes not drunkenness; but intemperance produces it. Do not accuse that which is the workmanship of God [wine], but accuse the madness of a fellow-mortal. Otherwise you . . . are treating your Benefactor with contempt'.

"When, therefore, we hear men saying such things, we should stop their mouths; for it is not the use of wine, but the want of moderation, that produces drunkenness, that root of all evils. Wine was given to restore the body's weakness, not to overturn the soul's strength. . . . For what is a more wretched thing than drunkenness! The drunken man is a living corpse.—Concerning the Statues. Homily I. 11-12.

"For instance, I hear many say, when these excesses happen [women's getting drunk and shaming themselves in public], 'Would there were no wine'. O folly, O madness! When other men sin, do you find fault with God's gifts? And what great madness is this? What! Did the wine, O man, produce this evil? Not the wine, but the intemperance of such as take an evil delight in it. Say then, 'Would there were no drunkenness, no luxury'; but, if you say, 'Would there were no wine', you will say, going on by degrees, 'Would there were no steel, because of the murderers; no nights, because of the thieves; no light, because of the informers; no women, because of adulteries'; and, in a word, you will destroy everything. But do not so; for this is of a satanical mind. Do not find fault with the wine, but with the drunk-

enness. And, when you have found this self-same man sober, sketch out all his unseemliness, and say to him, 'Wine was given that we might be cheerful, not that we might behave ourselves unseemly; that we might laugh, not that we might be a laughing-stock; that we might be healthy, not that we might be diseased; that we might correct the weakness of our body, not cast down the might of our soul.' . . . "It is not possible, with drunkenness, to see the kingdom of heaven. 'Be not deceived', it is said, 'no drunkards, no revilers, shall inherit the kingdom of God'."—St. Chrysostom, on the Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily LVII. 5-6.

Augustine, Saint, Bishop; the greatest of the Doctors, Latin and Greek; and the greatest intellectual influence that has ever arisen in the Church; 354-430 A. D.—

In his Treatise "On the Morals of the Manichaeans", XVI. 44, he speaks of wine in these friendly terms: "Who does not know that wine becomes purer and better by age? Nor is it, as you think, more tempting to the destruction of the senses, but rather is it more useful for invigorating the body;—only let there be moderation, which ought to control everything. The senses are sooner destroyed by new wine. When the must has been only a short time in the vat, and has begun to ferment, it makes those who look down into it fall headlong, affecting their brain, —And, as regards health, everyone knows that bodies are swollen up and injuriously distended by new wine".

In his "Reply to Faustus the Manichaean", Book XX. 13, St. Augustine asks, "How can Faustus think that we resemble the Manichaeans in attaching sacredness to bread and wine, when they consider it sacrilege to taste wine? They acknowledge their god in the grape, but not in the cup. . . . What is not consecrated, though it is bread and wine, is only nourishment, or refreshment, with no sacredness about it; although we bless and thank God for every gift, bodily as well as spiritual".

"Indeed, how great is this perversion,—to consider wine as the gall of the princes of darkness, and permit grapes to be eaten"!—On the Morals of the Manichaeans, XVI. 44.

"For they [the Manichaean Catharists] do not even drink wine, declaring it to be the gall of the princes of darkness, while they eat the grapes; nor do they sup any must or fresh wine" (De Haeres. XLVI).*

SUMMARY OF PATRISTIC EVIDENCE

The testimony cited from the Fathers on wine is far from complete; but it is representative and sufficient. It shows that the New Testament use of wine in the Holy Communion was continued, and in the later period was universal. Where there was a departure from this practice, as in the instances cited by Prof. Harnack, it was in favor of water, not of grape-juice; and water, by universal consent, was not the beverage used by

*For the last two citations from St. Augustine I am indebted to the Rev. Thomas H. McLaughlin, D.D., of Seton Hall College, South Orange, New Jersey.

our Lord in instituting the Feast. This brazen innovation was frowned on by the Christian conscience, and died out.

Also, the Fathers, with few exceptions, admit wine as a beverage, speaking of it in the most laudatory terms. Those who condemn it, such as Ambrose and Jerome, do so, not as wine, but as a luxury, in their recommendation of a general asceticism. They include in the same condemnation toothsome foods.

For the most part, those who banned wine were heretics, who placed meat and marriage under the same anathema.

The witness of the Fathers cannot be disposed of by slurring them as "creatures of an apostate Rome", as has been attempted. In the first place, Rome was not apostate. On the contrary, it was a faithful and true witness of the Faith. In the second place, the saints and martyrs of the Eastern Church were just as staunch defenders of wine, both for sacramental and common use, as those of Latin Christianity. And, in the third place, even the Latin bishops were far from being "creatures of Rome". Was Cyprian a "creature" of Rome? Yet he rebuked the use of water for wine in the Holy Communion.

And a significant fact is that sweet grape-juice, as a beverage, is scarce alluded to. It was an article of no vogue or consequence.

However we may differ from their teaching, we may not slur these great champions of the faith, many of whom witnessed a good confession at the stake, in the arena, by the sword, because their attitude to drink may not suit us,—especially as,

in this attitude, they were at one with apostles, prophets, and Jesus Christ himself.

It is significant, too, that they never understood the Pauline principle, "If meat causeth my brother to offend", etc., to require abstinence from either meat or wine. Men, some of them men of genius, who gave their lives to the study of the Scriptures, as they did, might be supposed, if their judgment and conscience were even ordinarily correct, to have a sound judgment in such a matter. Yet they never found in this teaching of St. Paul what some today find there. They did find in it what the common-sense of all later ages has found, the duty of Christians to be tender of the mistaken scruples and fleshly infirmity of their weak brethren.

If the New Testament Church, again, had used grape-juice, and the subsequent Church had disloyally substituted fermented wine, we are puzzled at finding no record of the change; for surely there must have been a bitter contest. Surely there were those who would have resisted this unscriptural novelty even unto death. Yet who were they? Every jot and tittle of the great and bitter literature that the controversy must have provoked has perished,—not a syllable remains. Yet the effort to substitute grape-juice for wine today, in a small portion of the church, has given birth to just such a literature, so continuous and so extensive that its obliteration is unthinkable. Far less important controversies have survived from those days. Why not this? We must answer, "Because there was no such controversy"; and there was not, because there was no such change.

The same wine was used as had been used from the beginning. Even those who themselves rejected wine as a beverage never denied that Jesus and the Apostolic Church had used it.

The Christian Church, then, used wine before it used the Gospels. It used wine before the Epistles were written. Before a word of the New Testament Scriptures was penned, the Lord's Supper and the Love Feast, whether at first one and the same or two connected acts, were celebrated with the unfailing use of wine, of real wine, of wine that, too largely used, intoxicated. The Church used wine thus because Jesus Christ had done so himself and had enjoined all his followers to do the same, until his "coming again". It was Jesus who, at that sacred feast, surrounded by his twelve apostles, raised high in his "holy and venerable hands" two goblets of wine, and gave thanks to the Eternal Father for this fruit of the vine; and then offered it to all his apostles, saying, "Drink this, all you drink this". It was Jesus Christ who said to his disciples, not only to the twelve apostles who were to be the foundation stones of the new city of God, but to all his disciples to the end of time,—it was Jesus Christ who, offering them an alcoholic beverage, said, "Drink"; who said, "All of you, drink",—having drunk first himself;—to all his disciples, not to the Twelve alone; for what else can his words mean, as he handed them the cup of wine, "This do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me"? It was an institution that Jesus was founding, not a solemn farewell that he was offering to his closest friends.

Jesus was no total abstainer. His twelve apostles were no total abstainers. It was not only the traitor, who had a devil, who drank. It was also those who, hesitating at first, like the homing pigeon just released, were to be faithful unto death; whose names our churches bear, the round world over.

And St. Paul, who came after, and who left the earliest account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, was no total abstainer. Alcoholic wine was to him an integral part of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

The primitive church, then, used this sacramental wine with its first use of the sacrament. As early as it used water in baptism, it used wine in the Lord's Supper. The primitive church thought that in this it was following the example and injunction of its Lord. The universal church believed that Jesus used wine at the Lord's Supper. And this belief of the primitive church was the unanimous belief of the church through all the ages. On much else the church differed and fought and split. But on this there was no difference. If anything in church history is catholic, this is. Most held indeed that Jesus had mixed water with the wine, after the custom of the Jews, and of the ancients generally; and this was the practice of the church. But no one suggested that he had used, not wine, but unfermented grape-juice. There were heresies and schisms on many matters of faith, practice, and tradition. But there was none here. None maintained that the wine used by our Lord was other than the wine used by the church.

The fact that the church mixed the sacramental wine with water, indeed, indicates the nature of the wine used. Would it have required grape-juice to be diluted? The tradition is correct which refers this usage to the example of Jesus. The Passover wine was so diluted from time immemorial; and Jesus was thus only following ancient use. Nor was wine diluted in the Passover Supper for any mystical reason. It was diluted then because it was diluted almost always, as a beverage; as in France today. To drink undiluted wine was considered improper, as being too strong.

The departures, of whatever sort, from the old ways the church condemned. It would stand no trifling with a sacrament established by Christ: it would tolerate no such implied slur on his word and ways. As the church sharply distinguished between the use and the abuse of marriage and of meat, so it did of drink. All three, it said, were good gifts of God. There might indeed be reasons which would make it advisable for an individual peculiarly constituted to refrain from any one or from all three,—reasons which it included under the general term of discipline. But these occasional individuals must recognize that the reason for their peculiar course was in themselves, not in others nor in the thing refrained from. God gave marriage; God gave meat; God gave wine,—not to be refrained from, but to be used; and the obligatory use of wine in the Lord's Supper was a declaration by the church, and an admission by the ascetic, that such was the case.

CHAPTER III

THE MIDDLE AGES

I

The attitude of the primitive church toward wine was the attitude of the later church. Everywhere, always, and by all, was wine blessed and drunk in the most solemn and exalted of the church's rites,—as it had been by its Founder and Lord. In the name of Jesus was the bread broken. In the name of Jesus was the wine poured and put to the lips of the faithful with the injunction "Drink!" The church thought it as holy and blessed a thing to say "Drink" as it did to say "Eat",—as good and righteous a thing to drink wine as to eat bread.

It is not necessary to prove the hospitable attitude of the Church toward drink during this period, that is, up to the Reformation, since no one denies it. But a few facts may be cited in illustration.

St. Patrick not only, according to the medieval legend, drove snakes out of Ireland, but introduced whiskey into Ireland,—whiskey and the art of its distillation. The medieval Christian conscience saw in this nothing unworthy of so saintly a man; the chances are, in fact, that the whole story was invented to do him honor. At least, we may hope so. Now, to be sure, whiskey is not wine; nor is it the "strong drink" of the

Scriptures. But it is much more hazardous; and an age that saw nothing wrong in whiskey surely would not in wine or "strong drink".

The next significant fact is that throughout western Christendom the most famous drink was made by monks, both wines and ales. The special value of the waters of Burton-on-Trent for brewing was discovered by the neighboring monks. The malt-house, indeed, was as indispensable a feature of a monastery as the chapel. In medieval England an "ale" was synonymous with a parish festival, at which this was the chief drink. The word was frequent in composition. Thus, there were Whitsun-ales, clerk ales, church-ales, bridales (now bridals). The "bridal" is the bride plus ale, or wedding feast. The parish ales were of much ecclesiastical importance in England. The chief purpose of church- and of clerk (that is, clergy) -ales was to facilitate the collection of parish dues or to make an actual profit from the sale of the beverages by the church wardens. These "ale" profits kept the parish church in repair or were distributed as alms to the poor. At Sygate, Norfolk, on the gallery of the church is inscribed—

> God speed the plow
> And give us good ale enow . . .
> Be merry and glade
> With good ale was this work made.

On the beam of a rood-screen in the church of Thorpe-le-Soken, Essex, is the following inscription in raised Gothic letters, on a scroll held by two angels—

"This cost is the bachelers made by ales thesn med".

The date is about 1480. Church-ales were also held in honor of the patron saint. The feast was usually held in a barn near the church or in the church-yard. In Tudor times church-ales were held on Sundays. Gradually the parish ales were limited to the Whitsun season, and these still have local survivals. The colleges of the Universities used formerly to brew their own ales and hold festivals known as college-ales. Some of these ales are still brewed and famous, like "Chancellor" at Queen's College, and "Archdeacon" at Merton College, Oxford, and "audit ale" at Trinity, Cambridge.

Lamb-ales are still maintained at Kirtlington, Oxfordshire, for an annual feast at lamb-shearing.

When the statues of virgins and saints were smashed by iconoclastic reformers, the irreverent figures carved on some churches representing jovial participants in "ales" were not disturbed. The feelings of the Puritans were not offended by the figure of a toper on the front of a house of prayer.

To the second half of this period belongs the famous *Benedictine* liqueur. It continued to be manufactured by the monks at Fécamp, France, on the English Channel, till the French Revolution. Since then it has been produced commercially by a secular company. The familiar legend, D.O.M. (Deo Optimo Maximo) on the bottles

preserves to this day the memory of the original makers.

"The equally famous Chartreuse, made by the Carthusian monks at Grenoble, has been the main support of the churches, schools, hospitals, etc., in the villages round about. Since the expulsion of these monks in 1904, they have continued the manufacture of their liqueur in Spain."

It is noteworthy that it was not alone the secular clergy and worldly laity that patronized drink, as in the "ales"; the rigorous and ascetic "religious", such as the Carthusians and Benedictines, saw nothing in the production or use of drink inconsistent with the Christian ideal.

II

Wine was enjoined in the Church at marriages, in the Hereford Missal: "After the Mass [the original is Latin], let bread, and wine, or some other good drink, be brought in a small vessel, and let all drink".

By the Sarum Missal it is enjoined that the sops immersed in this wine, as well as the liquor itself, and the cup that contained it, should be blest by the priest: "Let the bread and wine or some other drink be blest in a small vessel, and let them taste it, in the name of the Lord, the priest saying *Dominus vobiscum*". The form of benediction ran, "O Lord, bless this bread and this drink and this vessel, as thou didst bless the five loaves in the desert and the six waterpots in Cana of Galilee, that all who drink out of them may be healthy and sober and undefiled", etc.

The beverage, on this occasion, was to be drunk by the bride and bridegroom and the rest of the company.

The allusions to this custom in our old plays are numerous; as in Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew* (III. 2), where Petruchio calls for wine, gives a health, and, having quaffed off the muscadel, throws the sops in the sexton's face.

*The Compleat Vintner,** a poem of about the year 1720, but voices the feelings of the old church and its people, when it says,

> What priest can join two lovers' hands
> But wine must seal the marriage bands?
> * * * * * * *
> As if celestial wine was thought
> Essential to the sacred knot,
> And that each bridegroom and his bride
> Believed they were not firmly tied
> Till Bacchus, with the bleeding tun,
> Had finished what the priest begun.

It is true that ale is not wine. But, if the Bible and the early Church approved wine, the approval covered anything of the sort no more hazardous than wine.

*Many of these facts are from the article "Ales", in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th Edition.

CHAPTER IV

THE REFORMATION

I

The Reformers had nothing to object to in the attitude of the old Church to drink. Their own attitude was the same. These beverages were, to them, as allowable as water or milk. John Knox "had his pipe of Bordeaux too, we find, in that old Edinburgh house of his" ("The Hero as Priest", in "Heroes and Hero-Worship", by Thomas Carlyle, toward the end). Now a "pipe" held from a hundred to two hundred gallons! Calvin, too, used wine: "Sometimes in the middle of the day he would suck an egg and take a glass of wine".—Life of John Calvin, by Dyer, page 436. His salary at Geneva included "two casks of wine".—Life of Calvin, Paul Henry (trans.), page 269. So did Luther. The latter indeed ran a private brewery, and declared that as a remedy for worry drink ranked next to the Lord's Prayer and a good heart!

Mrs. Luther "at Wittenberg . . . brewed, as was then the custom, their own beer".—Kostlin's Life of Luther, page 541.

"In the evening he would say to his pupils at the supper table, 'You young fellows, you must drink the Elector's health and mine, the old man's, in a bumper. We must look for our pillows and bolsters in the tankard'. And in his

lively and merry entertainments with his friends the 'cup that cheers' was always there. He could even call for a toast when he heard bad news, for, next to a fervent Lord's Prayer and a good heart, there was no better antidote, he used to say, to care''.—Ditto, page 558.

Shortly before his death ''a rich present of wine and fish had arrived from the Elector. Luther was very merry with his friends''.—Ditto, page 568.

''He wrote to his wife telling her he was cheering himself with good Torgau beer and Rhine wine''.—Ditto, page 571.

From another letter to his wife: ''The town council gives me for each meal half a pint of 'Reinfall', which is very good. . . . The wine of the country here is also good, and Naumburg beer is very good.

Your loving

MARTIN LUTHER''.—Dit. p. 574.

Feb. 15, 1546.

I have not been able to find a single one of the Reformation leaders who did not drink. All the heads of the Reformation in England drank. If any abstained, in those days, it was from reasons personal to himself: none objected to drink on principle. The differences, indeed, between the Reformers and the ancient Church were many and grave. They pertained to doctrine, morals, worship, discipline. But, as to drink, Catholics and Protestants were at one. Luther and the Pope alike used it, and alike thanked God for it. They did not even re-

mark that in this, at least, they were agreed. So far was disagreement here from their thoughts that they did not even remark its absence. Nobody on either side intimated that it was wrong to drink. If any one had, Luther and Pope would both have denounced him as a calumniator of the Scriptures, of the Church, of Jesus Christ. Those were days when many strange, extravagant, fantastic, whimsical notions were broached; but never this. The Reformation pursued its course for generations without discovering the sinfulness or general inexpediency of drink.

Now let us look at those immortal contributions of Non-Conformity to the English classics, "The Pilgrim's Progress" and "Robinson Crusoe"; to which may be added "Swiss Family Robinson", by an eminent Swiss Protestant; and Goldsmith's "Vicar of Wakefield", by an Episcopalian.

Bunyan was surely pious enough to suit the most exacting. One after the other, he had given up all amusements, even such innocent ones as church-bell ringing, and dancing on the village green. But it never occurred to him to give up drinking; and, what is more, he represents Christian and Christiana as frequently, if not ordinarily, drinking, on their way to the Celestial City, and as being helped on their way by this drink. Christian's "good companions", Discretion, Piety, Charity, and Prudence, gave him "a bottle of wine", to cheer him on his way. After his battle with Apollyon, the spent fighter betook himself to the bottle for refreshment. In the

"very sweet and pleasant" land of Beulah, the "Shining Ones" have "no want of corn and wine"; "rum" in Paradise! Christ sends to Christiana, by the hand of Greatheart, "a bottle of wine". Gaius, the holy inn-keeper, served Christiana and her party a noble repast, most Scriptural in character, a heave-shoulder, a wave-breast, "very fresh and good"; and "the next they brought up was a bottle of wine, red as blood. So Gaius said to them, Drink freely; this is the juice of the true vine, that makes glad the heart of God and man. So they drank and were merry". "The wine when it is red" was, to Bunyan, a choice gift of God. On setting out from this hospitable inn, Gaius gave them more drink, and they were merry again. Nor did this pious inn-keeper scruple to give "them something to drink by the way"; and that, even though the party included "Mr. Feeble-mind"!

And Bunyan saw nothing worse in "spirits" than in wine; and both alike had their part in helping the pilgrims on their heavenly journey. Mr. Interpreter gave Christiana "a little bottle of spirits", of which she and Mercy, and probably the children, drank. Then they set out; but "Christiana forgot to take her bottle of spirits with her; *so she sent her little boy back to fetch it*"! When her son James was taken sick, "his mother gave him some of that glass of spirits". Mr. Fearing, it will be remembered, had a hard time of his pilgrimage, but was "a little encouraged at the Interpreter's house". As he was setting out, the Lord, "as he did to Christian before, gave him

a bottle of spirits". When Mr. Despondency was in a bad way, "Christiana gave him some of her bottle of spirits, for present relief".

The Puritan Bunyan thought drink a real aid in our Christian pilgrimage.

It is not necessary to show how in "Robinson Crusoe" drink is regarded as one of the necessities of life,—whether ale or wine or even, literally, rum. In a brief and partial inspection I have collated twenty passages of this tenor. It no more occurred to Defoe, the Non-Conformist, to question the propriety of drink than of water or milk or food.

That pious and benevolent character, the Vicar of Wakefield, speaks thus kindly of the country tavern (near the beginning of Chapter 18): "I retired to a little ale-house by the roadside, . . . the usual retreat of indigence and frugality". Toward the end of this chapter, "I took shelter, as fast as possible, in the first ale-house that offered", where he and a chance acquaintance shared "in a bowl of punch".

"The Swiss Family Robinson" is an exhibition of Christian principle in actual practice amid most primitive conditions. It is much later than the other two works; and it represents the Protestantism of the Continent. But this Swiss Protestant, Jean Rudolph Wyss, is at one with Bunyan and Defoe and Goldsmith as to drink. He tells how warm cocoa-nut milk had fermented into what Fritz pronounced "excellent wine",

which foamed like champagne. With a warning against excess, the father allowed his son to drink it, and himself drank: they "were both invigorated". The first supper that was served in good style by Madame Robinson, in the woods, ended "with a bottle of the captain's Canary wine". On another occasion, the mother greeted her husband, after an absence, with the joyful news of the discovery of a cask of Canary wine, which had drifted up on the beach. Father, mother, and sons all took turns at the vent-hole with straws, until the boys had to be checked for fear of intoxication.

Medford rum (not covered by the Scriptural and ecclesiastical sanctions of wine and "strong drink") was the respectable foundation on which the fortunes of many a pious Puritan family of New England were raised.

The city of Newark, New Jersey, is said to have been the last effort to build up a theocracy, or Kingdom of the Saints, in this country. It is therefore significant that among the goods given the Indians in payment of the land were* "four barrels of beer", and "two ankers [that is, about 20 gallons] of liquors".

From this town's early records I extract the following:

Town Meeting, Jan., 1668.

Item—*Henry Lyon is Chosen Treasurer for the Year Insuing.*

Item—*The Town hath Chosen the sd Henry Lyon, to keep an Ordinary for the Entertainment of Travellers and Strangers, and desire him to*

*Urquhart's Short History of Newark, page 18.

prepare for it, as soon as he can (N. J. Historical Society, Records of Newark, vol. VI. p. 13).

Now an "Ordinary" was a tavern or inn; of which the sale of liquors was an invariable feature. As Mr. Lyon was both town-treasurer and inn-keeper, no doubt the good citizens repaired to the tavern to pay their church dues,—a part of their taxes.

On page 34, under 2nd June, 1670:

Item—*The Town Choose Thomas Johnson to keep an Ordinary in the Town for the Entertainment of Strangers, and prohibited all others from selling any Strong Liquors by Retail under a Gallon, unless in case of Necessity, and that by Licence from the Magistrate.*

The "History of the Oranges", by Wickes, page 128, in telling of the Mountain Society, or Church, now the First Presbyterian Church of Orange, has in the list of subscriptions toward the construction of the Second Meeting House, in 1753, these entries:

John Dod, a gallon of Rum, 4 *s.*

Eleazar Lamson, 6 *quarts of Rum,* 6 *s.*

Thus, in a manner, the corner-stone of this venerable Church, the First Presbyterian of Orange, was laid in rum.

Among the house-keeping accounts of the pastor, for 1759, are these items:

Cyder Spirits—[apple-jack?] 3 *gallons,* 10 *s.* 6 *d.*

1 *Barrel of Cyder,* 9 *s.*

Tobacco, 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

When his estate was appraised, it revealed,

7 *Wine-glasses,* 8 *s.* 9 *d.*

II

Methodism.—We have seen the friendly attitude toward drink of Luther, Calvin, and Wyss, standing for the Protestantism of the Continent; of John Knox, Presbyterian; of John Bunyan, Baptist; of Goldsmith, Episcopalian; of Defoe, Non-Conformist; of the New England Puritan, Congregationalist. It remains only to inquire the attitude of the fathers of the last of the great Protestant families,—Methodism.

As everybody knows, John Wesley was the pope of Methodism to the day of his death. He was the sole fount of authority for the new Society, both in doctrine and discipline. His wide learning, his holy zeal, his genius for organization made him first without a second in the great rebirth of religion among English-speaking people: and, if he exercised an unrivalled and unlimited authority, it was with the glad and grateful acquiescence of those over whom he ruled.

John Wesley was born in 1703, and died in 1791. He took Orders in the Church of England, and to the end declared himself a loyal minister of that Church. He was, too, an Oxford man, of various learning.

In an almost uninterrupted outpour of tongue and pen for fifty years, it is safe to say that there is no important phase of Christian belief and conduct on which John Wesley did not make his mind clear,—and over and over again. Of drink he spoke repeatedly, and his own behavior in the matter he explains himself. What, then, did John

Wesley, the Father of Methodism, say and do about drink?

From first to last he denounced dram-drinking and dram-shops. At the first Methodist Conference, in 1744, it was resolved that preachers were to speak "expressly and strongly against dram-drinking" (Tyerman's Life and Times of John Wesley, vol. I. page 446). Among the "Rules of Band Societies", in 1744, the first "Direction" was "To abstain from . . . tasting spirituous liquors" (Tyerman, vol. I. page 464). In the Conference of 1765, it was declared that some Methodists "drank drams . . . To remedy such evils, the preachers were enjoined, on no account, . . . to drink drams themselves" (Tyerman, vol. II. page 540). In a famous letter Wesley directs the itinerant preacher, "Touch no dram. It is liquid fire. It is a sure, though slow, poison. It saps the very springs of life" (Tyerman, vol. III. page 44). In a letter to a newspaper, in 1772, he even ascribes the high prices [When have people not complained of high prices?] to the consumption of so much wheat by distilleries; and he advises that distilling be prohibited by law (Tyerman, vol. III. page 133). The following passage is valuable as confirming the indications in the previous passages of the sense attached by Wesley to the word "dram". In 1760 he wrote, "Drams, or spirituous liquors, are liquid fire" (Tyerman, vol. II. page 390). "Drams" are, for Wesley, what they are for the dictionary, "a drink of spirits; as, a dram of brandy",—the Century Dictionary. And a dram-shop is, by the same au-

thority, "A place where spirits are sold in drams or other small quantities, chiefly to be drunk at the counter".

Wesley's Journal,—March 12, 1743,—records that two members were expelled from the Society "for retailing spirituous liquors".

Did he feel the same way about wine and beer?

In the year 1763, when he was 60 years old, Wesley returned the following carefully considered answer to the question, "What is it best to take after preaching?"—"Lemonade; candied orange peel; or a little soft, warm ale. But egg and wine is downright poison. And so are late suppers" (Tyerman, vol. II. page 476). This egg-and-wine was evidently poison for the same reason as "late suppers" were; that is, not in itself, but because of the lateness.

Under date of Thursday, July 23, 1772, of the Journal, Wesley tells of reading, in the lately published "Medical Essays", how a person had been cured of dropsy by drinking six quarts a day of cold water; a second, by drinking two or three gallons of "new cyder"; a third, by drinking a gallon or two of "small beer" and the same quantity of buttermilk. His conclusion is: "Why, then, what are we doing in keeping dropsical persons from small drink? The same as in keeping persons in the small pox from air". Small beer, —that is, weak beer, such as is commonly drunk in this country now,—is commended by Wesley along with water, new "cyder", and butter-milk.

Even more significant is a letter to John Wesley included in his "Journal", under date of Nov.

20, 1767. It was written by a most devoted Methodist, to tell how the writer had reduced his living expenses, in order to give to the poor. He continues: "And I think the poor themselves ought to be questioned with regard to drinking tea and beer. For I cannot think it right for them to indulge themselves in those things which I refrain from to help them". Beer was, patently, in the thought of this pious Methodist, as proper a beverage as tea; and the only objection to either was the expense.

And now for wine.—Under date of Monday, Sept. 9, 1771, of the Journal, Wesley comments on a recent medical publication as follows:—"I read over Dr. Cadogan's ingenious 'Treatise on Chronical Distempers'. It is certainly true that 'very few of them are properly hereditary'; that most of them spring either from indolence, or intemperance, or irregular passions. But why should he condemn wine *toto genere,* which is one of the noblest cordials in nature? Yet stranger, why should he condemn bread?" "One of the noblest cordials in nature"! No wonder that Tyerman comments (vol. III. page 111), "Here he comes in conflict with modern teetotallers"!

At the outset of Wesley's voyage to Georgia, with which his independent ministry may be said to start, he writes, under date of Monday, Oct. 20, 1735, the following brief record of his experiment in total abstinence:—"Believing the denying ourselves, even in the smallest instances, might, by the blessing of God, be helpful to us, we wholly left off the use of flesh and wine, and confined

ourselves to vegetable food, chiefly rice and biscuit''. Twelve years later, in a letter to the Bishop of London (June 11, 1747), he tells the sequel of this experiment. The Bishop had reproached the Methodists with ''valuing themselves upon extraordinary strictnesses and severities in life''. To this Wesley replies,—''I presume your Lordship means the abstaining from wine and animal food; which, it is true, Christianity does not require. But, if you do, I fear your Lordship is not thoroughly informed of the matter of fact. I began to do this about twelve years ago, when I had no thought of 'annoying parochial Ministers', or of 'captivating' any 'people' thereby, unless it were the Chicasaw or Choctaw Indians. But I resumed the use of them both, about two years after, for the sake of some who thought I made it a point of conscience; telling them, 'I *will* eat flesh while the world standeth, rather than make my brother to offend'. Dr. Cheyne advised me to leave them off again, assuring me, 'Till you do, you will never be free from fevers'. And since I have taken his advice, I have been free (blessed be God!) from all bodily disorders''. When, years later,—I think toward the close of his life,—Wesley revised his publications, he added to this passage this footnote: ''I continued this about two years''; that is, the regimen prescribed by Dr. Cheyne. Then he resumed the use of both meat and wine, and continued them ''to the end of life'' (Tyerman, vol. I. page 117). He must have found their use, in moderation, quite consistent with freedom from fevers, in spite of Dr. Cheyne: for

in his last days he thanked God fervently for the robust health that, with few interruptions, he had enjoyed.

In the above passage, mark that when people began to think that Wesley made total abstinence "a point of conscience", he resumed the use of wine. He was determined to prove to them that total abstinence was not "a point of conscience". His thought was, in effect, as he indicates to us himself, I will drink wine, while the world standeth, rather than make my brother to offend. Offend how? Why, by supposing that abstinence from wine was a Christian duty; whereas, on the contrary, Wesley tells us expressly,—"Christianity does not require it". That one sentence,—"Christianity does not require it"; does not, that is, require abstinence from wine,—and he, no doubt, meant also, and possibly so much less, from beer,—is Wesley's verdict on teetotalism. When weak or censorious brethren thought he made it "a point of conscience" not to drink, he made it "a point of conscience" promptly to resume drink. He took the charge of teetotalism, as "a point of conscience", as a slur on his Christian character, to be instantly and vigorously repelled.

Another thing.—John Wesley never condemned the use of wine and beer; but he did discourage the use of tea, and he started and maintained as long as he could a society to promote this literal *tee*totalism. "Wesley believed its use to be injurious" (Tyerman, Vol. I., pages 521 to 523). But he did not believe the use of wine and beer

to be injurious, and he started no society to promote abstinence from these drinks.

As a clergyman of the Church of England, Wesley regularly and frequently celebrated the Holy Communion,—at times "an immense sacrament, such as Methodist Conferences and Methodist congregations now never witness" (Tyerman, vol. III. page 271). Now from the beginning of his ministry to the end he celebrated this Sacrament with fermented wine,—even to these "immense" congregations, which must have included weak brothers and reclaimed drunkards. It never seems to have occurred to him that it was wrong or dangerous to offer these miscellaneous gatherings the cup of fermented wine, with the exhortation, "Drink".

Charles Wesley was, in all this, like his brother; he too gave up the use of wine for the same limited period. I assume that he shared his brother's objection to "drams"; though on a cursory examination, I can find no evidence on this head. He celebrated the Holy Communion with fermented wine.

The Rev. George Whitefield was the flaming herald of the new Reformation, the mightiest preacher that Methodism has produced. Like the Wesleys, he visited Georgia; where he established an orphan asylum. He found that "among the regulations established by the Trustees, governing under the first Royal Charter (of 1732), the introduction of rum was prohibited" (History of Georgia, Charles C. Jones, Jn. Vol. I. page 110). On November 21, 1735, the common council re-

solved: "That the drinking of Rum be absolutely prohibited, and that all which shall be brought there shall be staved". Whitefield was strongly opposed to this prohibition. At his first visit to Georgia he expressed his persuasion and thought that it tended to keep the Colony feeble (Life of George Whitefield, M.A., Field Preacher, by James Paterson Gledstone, page 135). Later, when this prohibition was rescinded, Whitefield thought it was a step toward making Georgia as flourishing a colony as South Carolina.

And Whitefield's "Journal" records, under date of Monday, Aug. 28, 1739, on his sailing from Savannah: "They brought me Wine, Ale, Cake, Coffee, Tea, and other Things proper for my Passage".

The Rev. Thomas Coke was the first Methodist Bishop, being appointed thereto by John Wesley himself. Though he belonged to a later generation than Whitefield (he died in 1814), he was just as friendly to drink; as the following entry in his "Journal", under the year 1793, shows: "From Dominica we again proceeded on our voyage. But such a wretched crew, and such an infamous set of passengers, I never sailed with before. My friends had furnished me with a few bottles of excellent old rum for my voyage; but, after I was in bed, these poor creatures got hold of it, and intoxicated themselves" (Extracts of the Journal of the late Rev. Thomas Coke, LL.D. Dublin, 1816).

Francis Asbury, co-laborer and brother bishop with Coke, became, by his indefatigable and

truly apostolic labors, the "Father of American Methodism". Like Wesley, and unlike Whitefield, he was both preacher and organizer; but it was especially as organizer that he laid the foundations of Methodism in this country broad and deep and true. This good man died in 1816. His attitude to drink is revealed by an entry in his "Journal", under date of "Sabbath, March 24, 1805"; when already the total abstinence movement was beginning to be defined. This entry gives the gist of his sermon that day,—"Present your bodies a living sacrifice. . . . We must not only not live in the use of unlawful things, but we must not indulge in the unlawful use of lawful things: it is lawful to eat, but not to gluttony; it is lawful to drink, but not to drunkenness; it is lawful to be married, but it is unlawful for either husband or wife to idolize the other".

Thus it appears that the Wesleys, Whitefield, Coke, and Asbury all justified drink; all but the last drank, and as to him I cannot find whether he drank or not; the Wesleys objected to distilled liquors; but Whitefield and Coke, the mighty preacher and the premier Bishop, drank wine, ale, rum.

The Methodist Societies in America did not, for some time, go farther, in this matter, than John Wesley: they thought it enough to proscribe distilled liquor; first, the use of it; then the traffic in it. On Dr. Coke's visit to America, in 1784, he drew up, with Mr. Asbury, a small volume of 187 pages respecting the doctrine and discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America,

with explanatory notes. The 10th Section of Chapter 2 deals with the liquor traffic as follows: "If any member of our Society retail or give spirituous liquors, and anything disorderly be transacted under his roof, on this account, the preacher who has the oversight of the circuit shall proceed against him as in the case of other immoralities" (Samuel Drew's Life of Rev. Thomas Coke, page 114). As Dr. James M. Buckley says (History of Methodism, page 349), "this does not prohibit the retailing or giving of spirituous liquors, or subject the member to penalty or inquiry, unless something disorderly is transacted 'under his roof' ". This rule was reaffirmed by the Baltimore General Conference of 1796.

On the other hand, the "Minutes of Some Conversations between the Preachers in Connection with the Rev. John Wesley", in Baltimore, on April 24, 1780, has this "Question 23. Do we disapprove of the practice of distilling grain into liquor? Shall we disown our friends who will not renounce the practice?" And the answer is "Yes". Another Conference, "held at Ellis's Preaching House, May 6th, 1783, and adjourned to Baltimore the 27th", spoke to the same effect. The following year the Conference published "Section 10, Of the duty of Preachers: Do you choose and use water for your common drink? And only take wine medicinally and sacramentally?" Yet even as late as 1812 the following motion was defeated: "That no stationed or local preacher shall retail spirituous or malt liquors without forfeiting his ministerial character among

us". Dr. Buckley explains that "since the practice had grown up gradually, it was deemed by the majority improper to pass a rule at that time". A similar motion was passed four years later. Yet even as late a Conference as that of 1828 was occupied with "many petitions concerning ardent spirits. . . . a very moderate resolution was passed" (Buckley, page 450). It was still ardent spirits, rather than drink in general, that was opposed.

It would be unfair to look for entire consistency or faultless sequence in the initiation of a novel and radical policy against a world-wide and age-long practice, such as drink; and the Methodist body in this country came as close to it as could reasonably be expected. But the very hesitation and uncertainty bear witness to the fact that it was a new principle and a new practice that they were coming at, not the revival of an old one. It was a new and novel chapter in Christian history, without precedent in Bible or Church. And it was worked out by the Methodist body itself, rather than by its great founders and teachers. It is an unquestionable truth that the dogma of the evil of drink was never contemplated by the scholars, orators, and statesmen who gave Methodism to the world; they themselves would have fallen under its condemnation, both in principle and practice; and Wesley, who resumed drink to prove that Christianity does not require total abstinence, and Asbury who preached, "It is lawful to drink", would have made short work of this dogma, as alike mischievous and unscriptural.

Moreover, these great leaders all used wine in the celebration of the Holy Communion; and no one who does that can call it accursed.

The addition of Methodism completes the roll-call of Protestantism.

A QUERY

But may it not be that the wrong of drink was a truth not explicated in the Gospel, nor in Christian history, because of the present hardness of men's hearts, but dormant, nevertheless, as a seed truth, to germinate and rise into stately growth in these last days;—in this resembling slavery, tolerated in the Gospel, and approved till lately in the church, but still in organic contradiction with both? Let us see whether this is not a true parallelism.

Jesus never owned slaves. Jesus never changed a free man into a slave. Jesus taught, "All ye are brothers" (Mat. 23.8); Jesus taught, "Neither be ye called masters" (Mat. 23.10). But Jesus drank. Jesus changed water into wine. Jesus offered drink to his disciples and said, "Drink this, all of you drink this". Jesus blessed God for drink; but he never blessed God that there were slaves. And he never commended slavery as an institution to be cherished by his disciples till his coming again. In discovering that slavery was wrong, we have discovered only what Jesus knew and implicitly taught. But, if drink is wrong, then Jesus was wrong, wrong in his practice, wrong in his precept, wrong in his principle.

Till about the year 1800, then, neither the

Church nor any part of the Church nor any faction of Christians,—apart from the extreme ascetics of the first ages,—had discovered that it was wrong to drink. On the contrary, the Church of God of the Old Covenant honored God,—as they thought, in obedience to his own command,—by offering him drink on his altar daily; and few Old Testament observances, ecclesiastical or social, were complete without wine. Jesus reiterated the sanctification of wine in the worship of the Eternal Father, and bade his disciples continue this as a memorial of himself till the end of time. The holy Church throughout all the world,—with some deviations, local and occasional, when the church was finding itself, amid persecution and uncertainty,—so understood his words, and so, in love and loyalty, obeyed him. And perhaps no single hour has passed through all these ages, when drink has not been offered on some Christian altar,—and for the most part on altars unnumbered,—in the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, that rite at once awful and affecting,—which for the greater part of Christendom stands for the nearest access of man to God vouchsafed us here below. Throughout all the Christian ages, throughout the divine epos of the New Testament presided over by the heavenly Master of the Feast, throughout the supernatural drama of the Old Dispensation,—back, ever back, generation before generation, century before century, age before age, before there was a Holy Land, before the Revelation of Sinai was, before Israel went down to Egypt, till at last, dim, myste-

rious, the heroic figure of Melchizedek is discerned, king of Salem, and priest of God by an earlier consecration than that of Aaron, bringing forth to Abram, friend of God, Father of the Faithful, bread and yayin,—through all that immense span of time has drink been honored and used among the people of God. Jerusalem and Rome and Alexandria and Antioch and Carthage and Lyons and Canterbury and Worms and Augsburg and Geneva,—every nation and tongue and kindred have, with consentient voice, uttered its praise, witnessing of it, like the psalmist of Israel, that it cometh from God, and maketh glad the heart of man.

But about 1800 A. D. it was discovered that it was wrong to drink!

CHAPTER V

THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT

I

The Temperance people did not discover that it was wrong to drink from the Bible. In fact, they made two discoveries; first, that it was wrong to drink; and then, later, that the Bible taught that it was wrong to drink. They discovered that it was wrong to drink, originally, from seeing the awful ravages made by some kinds of drink in English-speaking lands. Until lately their doctrine has been confined to these peoples. Now it has some vogue in Scandinavia and in Finland. With these exceptions, it is virtually confined to the Puritan Churches,—Puritan by descent or affiliation. Here and there an Episcopalian or a Lutheran, imperfectly informed in his own doctrinal standards, may be found who professes this tenet; but these Churches, and the Catholic, are patently out of sympathy with it. Their members are free not to drink; they may encourage movements for total abstinence; but they do not teach that it is wrong to drink. And, as a fact, the membership of these bodies, as a whole, are not much interested in these "Temperance" movements; their interest is in the promotion of moderation. They maintain that they are following the old teaching, and the old way, of Church and

Bible, of saint and seer and Savior, the way of self-control and sobriety.

About a hundred years ago, then, a handful of earnest Puritans discovered that it was wrong to drink; and, later, they discovered that the Bible taught this. They pushed their propaganda with untiring zeal; and they have, in considerable part, converted the Puritan Churches to their view. A large part of the membership of these bodies have been brought to believe that the Bible forbids drink. They have been told so by their teachers; they are told so over and over again; their children are told so in the Sunday Schools; they believe what they are told; they read their Bibles with this preconception; the wine that they find praised there is unfermented grape-juice; only maledictions are associated with fermented wine; they never hear these teachings denied; they have no motive, and but inconsiderable qualification, for an independent examination of Bible teaching, "except some man shall guide" them; in common with the masses everywhere, history and universality, the consent of mankind, are only words to them. Is it any wonder that they go forth, conquering and to conquer, in the sacred cause of total abstinence, inspired with a "Thus saith the Lord"?

As conscientious Christians, they could do no less. And so they have over-spread Anglo-Saxondom, and in many portions of it have inaugurated policies of profound social and political importance. Their daring goal is no less than to drive drink off the face of the globe, to make mankind

teetotalers. They are moved by the mightiest impulse that man can feel, the conviction that they are doing the Lord's work. Tolerance, compromise, delay are, therefore, disloyalty. This is a conviction that wonderfully simplifies every situation to which it is applied. Humanly viewed, most situations have their difficulties. There is something to be said on both or on several sides. Facts must be got at; they must be weighed; experience must be taken into account; the surprises of human nature, as well as the fallibility of human judgment, may bring to naught the best intentions. All human plans are vulnerable to mortal weapons; they are obliged to justify themselves by homely facts and plain reasons. But the religious enthusiast, while not above using all these as far as they go, is not dependent on them. When they fail, he simply hurls the dogma of Omniscience and the anathema of Omnipotence against the accursed thing. And, in truth, this is his right, if only the dogma and anathema be authentic. But suppose they are not? Suppose that the Almighty has never "fixed his canon 'gainst" drink, but, on the contrary, has approved a certain form of it? Then, indeed, we may still approve of total abstinence; but it will be a different sort of approval, by no means so robust and inspiriting. Total abstinence will then, at best, be the likeliest treatment of a hard problem; whereas, on the other view, there is no problem, but only a plain duty. If the rigorists became convinced that the Scriptures do not condemn drink, the heart of teetotalism would sink. Had

it not been for this religious conviction, it is safe to say that intemperance would have been attacked along quite different lines, with quite different results. And yet our examination of the Scriptures obliges us to pronounce this conviction an error; for the Bible approves drink, in its place.

The cynic, indeed, may smile, as he contemplates such an amazing paradox of human reason; —that so many of those whose proud and unceasing boast it has ever been that the Bible, and the Bible only, is their religion pay no more attention to what it teaches about drink, in almost every book, than if it were a trade journal of the liquor-dealers! It is the old story of human nature, cast out at the door, coming in again at the window. Originally an indignant protest against those who set out to establish their own righteousness, rather than subject themselves to the righteousness of God (Rom. 10.3), rigorism, in this, has ended by doing that very same identical thing! It establishes its own righteousness, and calls it God's; and God's it calls the devil's!

II

Is rigorism right or wrong, again, in calling its campaign for total abstinence "the United Churches in action"? Is the Church of God today on the side of total abstinence as a religious duty, or indeed at all? Is even the Church of God in the United States committed to total abstinence?

The Methodist Church requires total abstinence.

The Presbyterian Church has never ventured further than a "solemn warning" against alco-

holic beverages, with a ban on the business and those in it. Despite this "warning", any member of this Church may drink,—yes, any clergyman of this church may drink,—without impairing his church status. His associates might, or might not, make it unpleasant for him, but he would not be subject to ecclesiastical discipline.

The Presbyterian General Assembly finds a warrant against drink in the Bible, as well as in good morals. It could scarce speak worse of free love than it does of drink. Yet, unlike the Methodist Church, it does not forbid it to its members. In fact, it does not forbid it in the sanctuary; for leading Presbyterian churches use fermented wine in the Holy Communion. This Church, however, penalizes the traffic: no Presbyterian may engage in it. Yet, by a curious anomaly, the customer goes scot free; he is even welcomed to the pew and the altar. It makes all the difference in the world on which side of the counter the Christian stands. For example, an elder buys wine of the dealer; the seller is excommunicated; but the buyer carries that very wine to the church, and assists in distributing it to the communicants in the Holy Communion!

The Baptist churches are, as a rule, against drink. But it is far from true that a man would be refused membership, or deprived of membership, for drinking, in all, or even most, Baptist churches.

The Congregational churches are, in a way, committed to total abstinence; but not in a very rigorous way. A man can be a good Congrega-

tionalist and a decent drinker at the same time. Many Congregational churches use real wine in the celebration of the Holy Communion.

The churches of the denomination known as Christian use nothing but grape-juice, and earnestly urge total abstinence on their members.

The Dutch Reformed Church, condemning the drink traffic, leaves its members free to drink; and I am told that real wine is oftener than not used by them in the Holy Communion.

The Moravian Brethren, though one of the smaller divisions of Protestant Christianity, have a more ancient and honorable history than most others. Their Protestantism has been vindicated in fire and blood too often to be called in question. Their witness to their convictions has, indeed, been singularly consistent and unworldly. It is not generally known that John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, was converted by the Moravians. And the unvarying testimony of these original and loyal Protestants is that drink is Christian. So far are they from any other thought that, like the ancient Catholic Church, which they left, they have, here and there, engaged in the manufacture of it. A friend writes me of one of the best known of these enterprises as follows: "The Moravian Brethren conduct a well-known Brewery at Niedermendig on the Rhine. It is famous for its natural cellars below ground, and is the property of the settlement of Moravian Brethren in Neuwied on the Rhine, by whom it is managed and run. I was for three years at the school of the Moravian Brethren in

Neuwied, and we boys were frequently taken by our teachers to visit this Brewery and taste its beer in the cellars". As I write, I have before me two photographs of this Protestant brewery, one being of the "Bierwirthschaft d. Brüdergemeine", and the other of the "Brauerei der Brüdergemeine", where the two chief brews of this Brotherhood, the "Herrenhuter-Bräu" and "Brüdergemeine-Bräu", are made and sold.

The Episcopal Church teaches the rightfulness of drink, in the most imperative terms, in the Catechism, to be learned before admission to the Holy Communion. Here is what the Catechism says:

Question:—*What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?* [That is, in the Holy Communion.]

Answer:—*The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine.*

As our bodies are what by the bread and wine? Why, *strengthened and refreshed.* That is, wine, like bread, is a food that strengthens and refreshes; at least, it is a refreshment, good for man. This is the formal teaching of the Anglican Churches, which make up the largest religious community in the English-speaking world, in fact almost twice as large as the next below it (32,000,000 Episcopalians, as against 19,000,000 Methodists; see the World Almanac).

When much was being said, in other denominations, about the iniquity of fermented wine in the Holy Communion, the House of Bishops of the

Episcopal Church in this country adopted the following Resolution, dated Chicago, Oct. 26, 1886:

"That, in the judgment of the House of Bishops, the use of the unfermented juice of the grape, as the lawful and proper wine of the Holy Eucharist, is unwarranted by the example of our Lord, and an unauthorized departure from the custom of the Catholic Church".

In their vindication of fermented wine the Bishops have the clear warrant of the Prayer Book, not only, as we have seen, in the Catechism, but also in the weightiest prayer of the Prayer Book's weightiest office, the Prayer of Consecration in the Office of the Holy Communion; which speaks of this fermented wine as a gift and creature of God: "these thy holy gifts", "these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine". It would, indeed, be hard, and probably impossible, to find an Episcopal church in the world in which unfermented grape-juice is used instead of wine; nor is there any party in the Church, nor would it be easy to find an individual member, that advocates its use there.

Every Episcopalian is free to drink or not. He is free to persuade his fellows, if he can, to abstain. But he is not free to pronounce drink wrong; for he is obliged, from time to time, to drink wine in the Holy Communion. From time to time the Church, in the most solemn and blessed act that it knows, puts the cup of fermented wine to the lips of every member, and literally says, "Drink". It puts that cup to the lips of every boy and girl admitted to Communion, and says,

"Drink". It is the church herself that says, "Drink". If her members are neglectful and dilatory, she has a form of rebuke and exhortation, that they may come and "Eat" and "Drink".

For many years, too, the Episcopal Church has been encouraging "Frequent Communion" among its members. Whereas in earlier times good Episcopalians went to Communion only quarterly, now they go once a month. Indeed, not a few communicate weekly; and some even daily. All this the Episcopal Church encourages. Yet this encouragement means that, so much more frequently, the Church puts the cup of fermented wine to the lips of the Communicant, with the injunction, "Drink". It entails that the taste and the smell of wine shall become a regular and frequent experience of the Christian life.

Now what is right inside the church cannot be wrong outside. It may be inexpedient, but not wrong. And, in consequence, Episcopalians are not often abstainers on principle. What Christ blessed with his presence and first miracle in Cana of Galilee, they feel, must be right and good,—not to speak of the numberless attestations of it elsewhere throughout the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as well as by the Church of Christ.

From the following utterance of Bishop Webb, of the diocese of Milwaukee, concerning saloons, it can be judged how Episcopalians feel about drink:

"The Episcopal clergy is inclined to regard with leniency the saloon in all its phases, so long

as the saloon is not detrimental, on its face, to public interest and morals. I believe that the general tendency of the Episcopal Clergy is to favor, rather than oppose, the well-regulated saloon. The saloon, when at its best, certainly has many things in its favor. It is a gathering-place of people, and in many instances of good people".

To the same effect, the Rev. Dr. Rainsford, lately Rector of the largest Episcopal Church in America, St. George's, New York:

"To drink is no sin. Jesus Christ drank. To keep a saloon is no sin". And the present Rector of St. George's Church, the Rev. Karl Reiland, agrees with him. He says,

"We've got to admit that the saloon is a necessity. It is the poor man's club. What we ought to do is try to improve the condition of the saloon; make it livable. Personally, I don't want to abolish the saloon".

The late Bishop Henry C. Potter, of the great diocese of New York, presided at the opening of the famous "Subway Saloon"; and this enterprise, as well as Bishop Potter's patronage of it, was commended by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the head of the whole Anglican Communion, visiting in this country at the time. The Archbishop declared that his wife was interested in a tavern of the same character in England.

Comparatively late in its history, the Roman Catholic Church withdrew the cup from the laity. This was not on account of any change in its belief concerning the use of wine. It still required the

officiating priest to drink of the cup; and it does today. And today, as in all its past, wine is held by that church a lawful and proper indulgence. The present pope, it is understood, takes a glass of wine with his dinner. Of the hundreds of popes it is not probable that even one was a total abstainer; and the idea of a prohibitionist pope is impossible. Yet Catholic total abstinence societies have done a good work, with the Church's blessing; not on the principle that drink was sinful, but that, for some, abstinence was safer.

The Holy Orthodox Church of the East, otherwise known as the Greek Church, does not present the wine to the communicant to drink. It employs the practice of intinction; that is, the sacred bread is dipped into the consecrated wine, and these both are received and swallowed together. This too is only a change in detail: the principle is unchanged.

What has been said of the teaching and practice of the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches concerning wine as a sacramental element and as a beverage is true of the other churches of the East; as well as of the Church of England before the Reformation.

The Lutherans, in various divisions, are one of the large ecclesiastical families in this country: they have about two and a third million members. Their general attitude is voiced by the Rev. Max A. L. Hirsch, of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Newark, N. J., in these words: "The ethical point of view is the manner of our taking [drink], the moderate or immoderate use falling under the

ethical consideration. The taking of wine in the Holy Communion, and its institution by our Lord, should alone be decisive on this question. . . . The church has to develop character and personality capable of acting freely, and not under compulsion, on moral issues. No man can be brought up honest by locking up all the things that he might steal".

Some of the Lutheran Synods, it is true, have, without committing themselves to the proposition that drink is wrong, gone so far as to advocate prohibition. But the great Synodical Conference, with 765,000 members, the General Council, with 500,000, and the Ohio Synod, with 133,000, as well as the great Synod of New York, with 34,000 members are all against the rigorist position. In fact, of the two and a third million members, over two million take this stand; and the tendency is not toward the increase, but the decrease, of those who depart from the historic and conservative Lutheran position.

There are, besides, some 2,000,000 Jews in the United States, with some 200,000 adults; among whom teetotalism has no standing. As the Jewish religion is a Bible religion, it may, in a broad sense, be brought under the term American Church.

There are, too, many minor religious divisions. The total church membership (including over 400,000 Mormons) for the year 1912 (according to the World Almanac for 1914), is 36,668,165. Of these the Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist, and Presbyterian furnish about 16,000,000.

The Catholics, Lutherans, and Episcopalians are about 16,500,000. This leaves nearly half a million members of Reformed Churches out; who, for the most part, are not against drink. But, of the four great Puritan bodies just mentioned, it is doubtful if even half the membership would subscribe to the proposition that it is wrong to drink. And, with the addition of the three or four millions belonging to the minor divisions, it is doubtful if even one church-member out of three, in this country, would assent to this proposition,—perhaps not one out of four.

If the rightfulness of drink were put to a vote of the clergy of this country, drink might be condemned. But, if they voted in proportion to the membership of their congregations, a pastor with a thousand members having ten times the voting power of a pastor with a hundred, drink would not be condemned even by the clergy. So far is it from correct that the campaign for total abstinence is "the united churches in action"! The very large majority of American Church people both drink and believe it right to drink. It would be impossible, otherwise, to account for the great and growing quantities of drink consumed. For these 36,000,000 church members carry with them enough children and enough adherents (members in all but name) to constitute virtually the population of the country. Again, if "the united churches" were "in action" politically against drink, drink would be outlawed: whatever the "united churches" of this country ask of the lawmaker they can have; for "the united churches"

are the country. No legislature, no congress, no administration would dream of withstanding them. Where drink carries an election, it is by church votes.

The Church of God in this country, we must concede, then, is not against drink.

The situation in England is even more adverse to the dogma that it is wrong to drink. The Church of England has no place for it; neither has the Roman Catholic Church. And the members of the Non-Conformist bodies, for the most part, drink. After a careful inquiry, I cannot find a single denomination in England, except the Salvation Army, that makes total abstinence a condition of membership; nor that requires unfermented grape-juice in the Holy Communion; nor instructs its members to vote for the abolition of the liquor traffic; nor slurs a minister for drinking. The Wesleyan Methodists do none of these things; nor the Primitive Methodists; nor the United Methodists. The Congregationalists do none of them; nor the Baptists. The Presbyterians do not. The Unitarians do not. At the same time, the Non-Conformist ministers are coming more and more to be total abstainers, and are commending it to their people. And unfermented grape-juice is taking the place of wine in their Holy Communion.

Against this latter practice the Church of England has set its face. Its feeling is well represented in the following letter of the Rt. Rev. Wm. Connor Magee, at one time Bishop of Peterborough, later Archbishop of York:

PALACE PETERBOROUGH,
December 21, 1884.

To Rev. A. F. Aylard,

"As regards the use of unfermented wine in the Eucharist, the case is entirely different. Its use is, in my judgment, illegal, the Church commanding 'wine' and not syrup to be used. It is at any rate contrary to the practice of the Catholic Church for eighteen centuries, and there is no plea of expediency to excuse it. The only possible plea advanced for it (and it is a weak one) is the case of one who is in danger of relapsing into intemperance, if he even in communicating taste or smell fermented liquor. Even in such a case I hold that such a one should refrain from communicating, accepting this loss of privilege as God's punishment and chastening for his sin, and comforting himself with the teaching of our Church that he who being unable to participate for any reason does by faith and in his heart feed on Christ, does receive the benefit of His Passion. But the case you describe has not even this weak plea for it. It arises simply from the false opinion entertained by Good Templars that *any* partaking of fermented liquor is *sin*. Those who hold this opinion are not diseased by intemperance but misled by fanaticism.

"To administer to these the Holy Communion otherwise than Christ hath commanded, is not to strain Christian charity out of pity for the weak, it is to pervert a Christian ordinance out of weak concession to the heretical opinions of those who regard themselves as strong and sounder in faith

than the Church and their pastor. I should add that this practice of using non-fermented wine in the Eucharist has been recently condemned by the Upper House, and if I remember rightly, by the Lower House also, of Convocation of this province. I therefore do not hesitate to advise, but further to *direct* you, to discontinue it. I am also clearly of opinion that this should be done openly, and not in any way in disguise or concealment, either of the fact or of your reason for it.—Very faithfully yours,

W. C. Peterborough."

The above letter is dated 1884. The Resolution of the house of bishops in the United States, already quoted, was two years later. And two years later still the Lambeth Conference of 1888, speaking for the Anglican Communion throughout the world, more strongly affirmed the same position in the following Resolution:—"That the Bishops assembled in this Conference declare that the use of unfermented juice of the grape or any liquid other than true Wine, diluted or undiluted, as the element in the Administration of the Cup in the Holy Communion, is unwarranted by the example of our Lord and is an unauthorized departure from the custom of the Catholic Church".

To sum up, for England: most Englishmen are church-members, and most Englishmen believe it right to drink.

The situation of the church in other English-speaking countries is not so very different from that in England or the United States. The

greater part of it consecrates and drinks an alcoholic beverage in the Holy Communion; and an even greater part uses drink as a beverage.

III

When it comes to Christendom as a whole, the doctrine of total abstinence has no great standing. It has some vogue in the Scandinavian countries; and in Finland; apart from these and Anglo-Saxondom, little or none; none in the Latin world; none in Russia; none in the East.

Whitaker's (London) *Almanack* gives Christianity nearly 500,000,000 followers. These are divided as follows:

Catholics	240,000,000
Protestants	150,000,000
Greek Church	100,000,000
Minor Bodies	———

Of these 500,000,000 (which include children), not more than 40,000,000 of population can be claimed as against drink; not more than that at the outside, inclusive of the immature children of teetotalers. In Catholic and Greek Christianity drinking is universal; and in Protestant Christianity there is an immense preponderance for it.

Besides, there are 10,000,000 Jews in Christendom,—all actual or future drinkers.

The rejection of unfermented grape-juice for the Holy Communion by historic Christendom, without exception, is all the more significant from the fact that, equally without exception, the validity of this beverage for the Holy Communion is

admitted, and has been admitted from primitive, or at least early, times by all these churches of East and West alike (See Notitia Eucharistica, by W. E. Scudamore, Second Edition, pages 883-885). The juice newly expressed from ripe grapes is valid; but it is lawful only in case of real necessity. Otherwise, however valid, it is "gravely illicit"; and he who consecrates it comes under the severest censure of the church. Thus, even though valid, the historic churches will have none of it.

"The Holy Church throughout all the world", then, does not believe drink wrong: it believes it right: it uses it in its holiest worship: it sanctions it as a beverage. Total abstinence, as a principle, is only a modern rigorist eccentricity; at outs with the Scriptures; at outs with the example and solemn precept of Jesus; at outs with antiquity and history; at outs with the Church of God today. It is provincial, as against ecumenical; sectarian, as against catholic; novel, as against ancient. Total abstinence, as a religious obligation, is a rigorist product. Where the Catholic Church is dominant, it has no standing. Where the Lutheran Churches are dominant, it has a limited or no standing. Where the Episcopal Church is strong, it has little or no standing. Apply this test to regions and localities, and see if it does not hold. Either it is rigorist, and not Christian; or it is Christian, and Christendom is not. This is not a hostile judgment; it is rigorism's own; for it makes the attitude to drink crucial for the faith. It declares that it cannot be true to the Bible and tolerate

drink. But Christendom declares that it cannot be true to the Bible and condemn drink. The contradiction is irreconcilable.

And rigorism is posed with this hard challenge: Can a single leader in the church of God (not a professed ascetic) be named, throughout the entire history of Revelation, from the call of Abraham till the year 1800, who refrained from drink, or counselled others to refrain from drink, on the ground that it was wrong?

CHAPTER VI

PROHIBITION

I

The religious principle of total abstinence was not tested on any general scale, in Christendom, since those early heretics, for the good reason that Christians did not think such a test needed, till the 19th Century. In the last century it has had many tests, though, till lately, only among Puritans. And here let me call attention to a remarkable characteristic of this movement, in the light of some first principles about which, in the abstract, Christians ought not to differ.

A man abstains from drink, while admitting its rightfulness, because he does not care for it; or because he judges it best for his health; or because he thinks his example will help a weak brother, perhaps in his own household. Or, again, a man abstains, because he thinks the Scriptures require it. Now, in every one of these cases, thinking as he does, he is right in doing as he does. No one can justly find fault with him. What he does, in this matter, is, in fact, his own business, no one else's. He, not some one else, is responsible for his course: "To his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be made to stand" (Rom. 14.4).

Further; any one who believes total abstinence a Christian duty has a right to persuade others to

this belief and practice, if he can. Only he must remember to speak the truth (as he sees it) in love. He must recognize in others the same right to search the Scriptures "whether these things are so", and to frame their conduct accordingly, as he exercises himself,—especially as his is the novel and exceptional, not the common and long received, view. Not only Christian obligation, but mere common modesty, would suggest a tone respectful, however positive, in his propaganda. He must not dictate: he must not abuse: he must not use force. If he cannot win by example and appeal, still he has done his whole duty. If he go further, he falls into the sin, without the excuse, of the Sons of Thunder, who would call down fire from heaven on those who would not hear: "But he turned and rebuked them" (Luke 9.54-55).

Now the Temperance Movement began with a full recognition of these elementary Gospel principles. At first, it was an appeal to men's conscience and judgment. It was a moral force wholly. At its very beginning, men and women were urged to pledge themselves to moderation in their drink: hence the term Temperance Movement. Soon, however, this simple requirement gave way to a pledge to total abstinence from "spirits", with only moderate indulgence in wine and beer. The title Temperance was retained, though now only in part applicable. And then total abstinence from all drink was exacted, still as a voluntary matter, and still under the denomination of Temperance, a term now altogether misapplied. And then followed the fourth stage, substituting force for con-

science. The disciples of the new crusade thrust their movement into politics; campaigns were waged about it; offices, salaries, honors were fought for in its name. This change of policy was, in effect, a declaration that moral and religious influences were not enough, that something more effective than education and suasion was needed, and that something was force. With this view, it was inevitable that the moral effort toward inculcating personal sobriety should fall into the background, and at last be lost to sight; and this is what has happened. The Temperance Movement today makes little effort, by personal appeal, or by the provision of counter interests, to win men individually or generally from intemperance. It relies on the written law to make and keep men sober.

This change of policy was of an importance that can hardly be overstated, for it made the Temperance Movement theocratic; that is, a movement to put the church in control of the state. The goal of the Prohibition Movement is just that, and the logic of the position is sweeping along to that goal unwitting multitudes, who would balk, if they saw early enough what they were coming to. Here, in proof, is a declaration from a platform of the Prohibition Party of Ohio: *The Prohibition Party of Ohio . . . recognizing Almighty God, revealed in Jesus Christ . . . and accepting the law of God as the ultimate standard of right . . . the initiative and referendum in all matters of legislation not distinctively moral.* Now here is a political party, seeking control of

the nation and all its parts,—and it puts in the front of its platform "Almighty God, as revealed in Jesus Christ". Jews, agnostics, unorthodox have no place in this party, and they would have none in the country, except on sufferance. The Prohibition Party would put "the law of God", as gathered from the Bible by themselves, on the statute book, and set the police to enforcing it. This is pure theocracy, such as was the ideal of the Middle Ages. We supposed we had gotten beyond all that; but here it is, facing us again, in the 20th Century, in America! The world moves, —in a circle!

II

The political fortunes of this religious propaganda have been various. It has controlled a number of states at times, and does now. In fact, it has undertaken to see that the whole country shall be under the prohibition regimen within half a dozen years. Nearly one-half of our population is said to be under political teetotalism. The mother State of this propaganda is Maine, with an experience of about two generations. Kansas has had it for a generation; North Dakota, well on toward a generation. Several other States have adopted this policy recently. But far the greater part of our teetotal population is under county or other district prohibition. In England the total abstinence movement has adopted quite a different policy, and has achieved no such growth as in the United States. On the whole, however, the religious principle of total absti-

nence has had a fair test, wherever there has been enough demand for it, with weapons of its own choosing. The question before us is how much, or how little, religion has profited from this new policy.

III

Certain characteristics of interest to church and religion can be plainly read in the Temperance Movement through its hundred years' history. These are worth enumerating.

First, for our own country;—and bear in mind the purpose of this propaganda,—the diffusion of the principle and practice of total abstinence, as something required by the Almighty.

1.—Its inspiration is purely religious.

2.—While religious, it is sectarian. Catholicism, Episcopalianism, Lutheranism will have none of it,—not to speak of Judaism.

3.—The religious motive expresses itself in a physical force movement, through law, having long since despaired of moral suasion.

4.—The Movement is rural, not urban. No considerable city in this country offers any encouragement to Teetotalism by Force. Worcester, Mass., is the largest city that has voluntarily tried it; and Worcester tired of it in a single year. Birmingham, Alabama, rid itself of it at the first opportunity. It seems as if growth, expansion, prosperity, beyond a certain point, in any city, were fatal to prohibition.

This appears to be true of States also. Few know that New York State once had prohibition,

for a brief period; that Massachusetts had it; and Rhode Island; and Connecticut; and Ohio; and Indiana; and Michigan; and Illinois; and Wisconsin. As these States developed, and their cities multiplied and grew, they rejected prohibition. New Hampshire has done this, since its cities began to forge ahead. Now the States of the South that have taken up prohibition are, industrially, where these other States were when they experimented with this policy. Will they, too, turn their backs on it, with progress and diversification? It is noteworthy that Maine, Kansas, and North Dakota have no considerable industrial centers. If any should arise and promise greatness, what will be the effect on prohibition in those States?

Now it is everywhere felt that a state exclusively agricultural, or non-industrial, is incomplete. It is the proper ambition of every State to develop great cities within it. If it is to be one-sided in any direction, it would choose to be urban rather than rural, like Rhode Island. What would this little State amount to, if consisting of farms? As it is, it fills a place in the public eye, and wields an influence in the national counsels, out of all relation to its size and population. This faith in the city may, or may not, be a good thing; but it is universal in our country, and in every other progressive country. The farming population are as eager to see the cities grow as the urbanites themselves. The whole of our South is a unit in believing that an indispensable requirement in realizing its magnificent possibilities is the building up of great cities; and it points with

pride to the growth of those it has. The steady trend of population to the cities, with their consequent political aggrandizement, makes the Prohibition cause a problem. The cities, with their great populations, and immense power and prestige, are gaining influence throughout the country; and the cities are against Teetotalism by Force. In fact, they are against teetotalism of any sort. And no less acute a philosopher of society than Frederick C. Howe has written a book entitled "The City, the Hope of Democracy". To be sure, the city can be over-grown too: there should be a balance between city and country. But improved farming means less farming; and there seems to be no reason to anticipate a halt or stop in the present city-ward trend for a long time to come. The "Back to the Land" oratory is an exhortation by some city people to other city people to go back to the land: the orators themselves have no thought of going back.

Moreover, every great city gives the tone to a considerable rural territory ministering to it; as New York and Brooklyn to Long Island. The permeation of Long Island by city ideas and city people has virtually blotted out prohibition from one end of it to the other.

Teetotalism has thus far failed to impress even a single city of the first or second class.

5.—The Temperance Movement has proclaimed itself the champion of Church and Home. If so, prohibition communities should show fewer divorces and larger church membership per capita than license communities. Fortunately, on both

these subjects, we have Government statistics; for Marriage and Divorce, for the twenty years ending in 1906; for Religious Bodies, the religious census of 1906. What do these statistics show?

(a) For the Family.—Let us take the three old-time prohibition States, Maine, Kansas, and North Dakota; and, on the other side, the three States that are the most liberal in the whole Union in their attitude to drink, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Nebraska. The U. S. Census furnishes the following divorce figures for these six States, as well as for the groups to which they belong, and for the Continental United States as a whole:

Divorces, Annual Average for the 5 years of which the year stated is the median year, per 100,000 population.

	1870	1880	1890	1900
Continental U. S.	29	38	53	73
North Atlantic Division	26	28	31	38
Maine	61	78	88	117
New Jersey	9	13	18	23
Pennsylvania	18	21	27	35
North Central Division	45	55	71	96
Kansas	51	44	84	109
North Dakota	—	46	47	88
Nebraska	29	43	71	82

Among these two groups (arranged in the Table, however, not as groups, but geographi-

cally), the one the prohibition group, and the other very "wet", the average for the latest period given in the Table is 104 2/3 for the prohibition states, per 100,000 of population; whereas the average for the "wet" states is only 46 2/3.

We might suppose that the bad divorce record of these prohibition States has been due to causes unrelated to drink, were this not an admission that, in these instances anyway, it is not drink that breaks up homes, but something else; and that, in the three "wet" States, it is not total abstinence that holds them together, but something else. In other words, drink is not the home-destroyer; teetotalism is not the home-preserver. At most, these are but elements contributing to the result.

But, if it be said that it is in fact drink, in spite of the prohibitory legislation, that has broken up these Maine, Kansas, and North Dakota homes, then this is an admission that drink is not got rid of by prohibition.

Note, secondly, that in this Government table the State with the longest prohibition record has the worst divorce record, Maine; that the State with the next longest has the next worst, Kansas; whereas the State with the shortest prohibition record is best off, in this direction, North Dakota. The longer the record of prohibition in these States, the weaker the family tie.

On the other hand, the two oldest of the three "wet" States, which have never been anything but "wet", are far better off, as to the family, than Nebraska, which once was "dry". If allowance be made for the very much smaller divorce

figures of the "wet" States to start with, the increase in divorce in the period covered by the table, in two groups, is discouraging to prohibitionists.

And further: the divorce figures for the three "dry" States are far above the average for the whole country,—for Maine, 117 as against a national average of 73; for Kansas, 109; for North Dakota, 88;—and, in the case of Maine and Kansas, far above the average of the Divisions to which they belong,—for Maine, 117 as against the North Atlantic Division average of 38; for Kansas, 109 as against the North Central Division average of 96. North Dakota alone is below the Division average, but not so much below it,—88 as against 96. But of the three "wet" States two are below the national average,—namely New Jersey and Pennsylvania; and all three are below the group averages.

Now let us view divorce in its relation, not to population, but to marriage. We will take the three old-time "dry" States, Maine, Kansas, and North Dakota, and compare them, in this aspect, with the same very "wet" States, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Nebraska; and, in addition, with Minnesota and Wisconsin, which are typical local option States,—that is, wet in the cities, dry in the country. The Government affords for these States the following facts:

RATIO OF DIVORCES TO MARRIAGES FROM 1887 TO 1906

Maine,	one divorce to	6 marriages
Kansas,	one divorce to	9 marriages

North Dakota, one divorce to 10 marriages
Wisconsin, one divorce to 15 marriages
New Jersey, one divorce to 45 marriages
Pennsylvania, one divorce to 22 marriages
Minnesota, one divorce to 15 marriages
Nebraska, one divorce to 10 marriages

Compare these ratios of divorce to marriage with that for the whole country for this period:

Whole country.....1 to 13½
Maine .....1 to 6
Kansas .....1 to 9
North Dakota.....1 to 10

In the North Central Division, with twelve States,

The ratio is.....1 to 10½
Kansas .....1 to 9
North Dakota.....1 to 10
Nebraska .....1 to 10
Wisconsin .....1 to 15
Minnesota .....1 to 15

The best record in the entire country is held by New Jersey, the "wettest" State in the Union, with its ratio of 1 divorce to 45 marriages (South Carolina does not permit divorce). North Dakota is 31st from the top of the list; Kansas, 35th; and Maine, 46th, almost at the bottom.

No doubt, many factors, as race, religion, industry, geography, enter into these results; but, teetotalism being one of the most striking of the

social facts in these States, it must accept its share of responsibility for the shameful state of the family. At all events, where enforced teetotalism has been tried on the most extensive scale, and for the longest time, it has not conserved the family.

But what is the effect of teetotalism on church membership? Where this doctrine prevails, does the Church flourish?

Maine, the mother of prohibition, with an experience of nearly two generations with this policy, according to the Religious Census of 1906, occupies a low place in the figures of church membership. Of the nine States in the North Atlantic Division, it had the lowest percentage of church members to the population: only 29.8 of every 100 persons in prohibition Maine were church members. The highest State in this division was Rhode Island, having 54 per cent, with a population living almost wholly under license. New Jersey, the wide open State, so called, had 39 per cent, 10 per cent more than Maine; and Pennsylvania had 43 per cent.

The North Central Division includes twelve States. The lowest church membership of the twelve is in prohibition Kansas, with 28.4 per cent, lower even than Maine. The highest State in this group is Wisconsin, with 44.3 per cent, the State long renowned for its beer,—so renowned that many years ago I saw in a beer garden in the city of Hannover, this sign, "Importirtes Milwaukee Bier"! In this same North Central Divi-

sion belongs North Dakota, with a church membership of 34.3 to each 100 of the population. Nebraska, however, has only 32.4 per cent, being higher than Kansas and lower than North Dakota. Be it noted that the percentage of church membership to the population of the whole country is 39.1; so that these three thorough prohibition States, Maine, Kansas, and North Dakota, are considerably below the general average of church membership. In fact, in the list of States, arranged according to church membership, North Dakota is 36th from the top; Maine, 44th; Kansas, 45th;—Oklahoma being 49th and last.

The figures show at least this, that teetotalism does not build up the Church, and that drink does not break it down. The Church is weakest, very often, where the teetotal spirit is strong. And it is strongest, sometimes, where the teetotal spirit is weakest.

I recall here a magazine article by the Governor of New Hampshire, some fifteen to twenty years ago, that State having then for a long period been under prohibition, in which he lamented the lapse of rural New Hampshire into virtual paganism. That condition has been radically changed by the great influx of French Canadians, with their intense religionism and their hospitality to drink.

It is a matter of almost weekly experience with city clergymen to receive appeals for help from struggling churches in States wholly, or largely, under prohibition. Even Kansas, with all its prosperity, has to appeal to New York and Penn-

sylvania and Massachusetts and Illinois for help to keep its churches alive. According to the teetotal reasoning, it ought to be the other way. But, in fact, are there many drinking communities in this country that ask help of a teetotal community for their churches? Or many prohibition communities (of any considerable extent) that do not ask such help of license communities? In fact, it seems to be the great license communities that, by their contributions, are keeping religion, or at least the church, alive in many a prohibition community. Missionaries from these "dry" places swarm the great "wet" centers, as regularly as the seasons,—Chicago, Boston, New York, New Orleans, Philadelphia, San Francisco. "Wet" religion supports itself, and helps to support "dry" religion as well. Were it not for this "wet" support, many a dry community would go bankrupt religiously.

In this sense, and to this extent, we must recognize, however regretfully, that "drink" money helps to maintain the teetotal churches.

When I use the word "communities", I mean actual, distinct communities, not what are virtually "wet" and "dry" divisions of the one community, such as Boston and its suburbs.

Are we to consider this not infrequent association of religious poverty and weakness with teetotalism an accident; as well as the association of freedom to drink with a strong religious communal life? Or is there a connection between the two sets of facts?

IV

This coincidence of teetotalism, where it has long prevailed, with a decayed home and church life might, perhaps, be offset, if it were driving drink out. But the consumption of drink in this country has for a long while been, on the whole, increasing, not only in quantity, but per capita. The following table from the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1912, shows the quantities consumed, and the average annual consumption, per capita, of distilled spirits, wines, and malt liquors in this country, from 1870.

	Distilled spirits	Wines	Malt liquors	All liquors and wines
Years	Galls.	Galls.	Galls.	Galls.
1870	2.07	.32	5.31	7.70
1871-80*	1.39	.47	6.93	8.79
1881-90*	1.34	.48	11.38	13.21
1896	1.01	.27	15.85	17.12
1900	1.28	.39	16.09	17.76
1907	1.58	.65	20.56	22.79
1908	1.39	.58	20.26	22.22
1909	1.32	.67	19.07	21.06
1910	1.42	.65	19.79	22.19
1911	1.46	.67	20.66	22.79
1912	1.44	.58	19.96	21.98

1913, distilled spirits, over 6 million gallons more than in 1912; malt liquors, nearly 3,150,000 barrels more than in 1912. (Internal Revenue Report for 1913.)

The Temperance Movement, then, is not driving drink out. Far from it: our per capita consumption of drink is increasing. There is no explaining

*Average for the period.

this clear, conclusive fact away: it is a fact that needs no interpreter,—the American people are drinking more, not less. Prohibition may point to the vast territory acknowledging it: but the consumption of drink is increasing. Prohibition may point to the great and growing proportion of the population living under it: but the consumption of drink is increasing. The vital fact is evidently not the law, but the growing consumption of drink. The clear and striking fact for the United States is this: the more prohibition, the more drink. I am not saying that there is any relation between the two facts. I am not saying that with less prohibition there would not be still more drink. I am simply saying that prohibition has gone on increasing, and drink has gone on increasing. Prohibition aims to stop drink, and drink has not stopped; it has increased.

V

At the same time, drink is decreasing in Europe, where there is no prohibition, to speak of. The abler leaders of the movement in this country frankly recognize this anomaly. The Rev. Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, in The Continent, of Chicago, calls it "the riddle of reformers the world over" that "countries with little or no prohibition are decisively reducing the national per capita consumption of liquors, while the United States, with more prohibition than any other country, has never succeeded in accomplishing such reduction in the nation as a whole, except temporarily in years of financial depression."

He adds,—"The fact to be faced is that Germany, with no prohibition and no temperance lesson laws, is steadily reducing the per capita consumption of liquors by out-of-school temperance education and organization.

"Bulgaria, with no prohibition, has only one-eighth as large a per capita consumption as Germany and only one-fourth as large as ours.

"In Holland, with no help from legislation, there has been a per capita reduction.

"In Great Britain there has been a reduction of consumption, with not even a local option law, until recently for Scotland only.

"Norway, with only a little 'dry' territory as yet, has reduced the consumption and consequences of drink.

"In Sweden there is reduced consumption also, with little aid from law as yet."

He speaks further of "the amazing failure of Americans to reduce our per capita consumption of liquors and the non-enforcement of 'dry' laws, which partly explains it".

He avers: "that we have grossly neglected educational temperance work in public schools and even in Sunday-schools, and most of all out of schools".

The Encyclopaedia Britannica declares, to the same effect: "While expenditure for drink has steadily fallen in the United Kingdom since 1899, it has as steadily risen in the United States; and, whereas in 1888 the expenditure in the former was 41 per cent higher than in the latter, the two had drawn equal in 1906 and since then have changed

places. . . . The comparison is of much interest in view of the very different laws and regulations under which the trade is conducted in the two countries" (Enc. Brit. "Temperance", page 584,—the conclusion being based on estimates from the *Prohibition Year Book*).

It may be said that, had it not been for this Temperance Movement, the consumption of drink would have been much greater. It may be so. Again, it is thinkable that, in the absence of the extreme and unconditional Temperance Movement which has pre-empted the field, another sort of reform in the matter of intemperance might have arisen and accomplished more, not only for moderation, but for total abstinence as well.

Another thing.—The church membership of this country was put by the last religious census at 32,936,445, out of an estimated population of 84,246,252. But this does not mean the church population. It excludes virtually all Protestant children; all Roman Catholic children under 9 years of age; all Jews except heads of families. It excludes also that large number of persons who are church members in all but name; who attend church; who contribute to its support; who believe in it, and follow its teachings; but who have not formally professed their allegiance. Now, if to the Government figures for church membership we add the children of members, and also these virtual members with their children, the church population becomes very nearly the same as the country's population. That is, what the people of this country do, the Church, in its large sense,

Jewish and Christian, does, so far as what is done is of concern to the church. This growing consumption of drink, then, is among church people. It is church people who are drinking these vast quantities of drink. We cannot say that this represents a universal rebellion on the part of the membership against Church authority, for an apostasy so universal and persistent would be fatal, even if possible. The fact is, the Church as a whole is tolerant of drink, except when it is obviously excess.

CHAPTER VII

INTEMPERANCE

I

Yet more drink, in our national history, does not mean more drunkenness: paradox as it is, it means less. There was never so little intemperance among us as today. There is more drinking, and less drunkenness. The Church has always insisted that sobriety was consistent with drinking; and experience seems to confirm this ancient wisdom. That intemperance is less common today than ever before in our history need not be demonstrated: everybody knows it. For example,—to go back to the Old World,—recall how the novelist Smollett (died in 1771) relates that the public houses in London put up signboards inviting people to be "drunk for a penny", and "dead drunk for 2d", with "straw for nothing" on which to sleep off the debauch. Lord Lonsdale, too, speaking in the house of lords, in 1743, said: "In every part of this great metropolis, whoever shall pass along the streets will find wretchedness stretched upon the pavement, insensible and motionless, and only removed by the charity of passengers from the danger of being crushed by carriages or trampled by horses or strangled with filth in the common sewers". And, as late as 1834, witnesses described, before a select committee of the house of commons, as scenes that regu-

larly occurred on Sunday morning in London, "crowds around the public houses, women with babies to which they gave gin, and people lying dead drunk in the streets".

Intemperance in this country never reached such a pass. But in both countries the forward movement has been concurrent. No such conditions as those just described are found in England today; and the hard drinking of a hundred years ago in this country is equally a thing of the past. Yet the striking fact is not the disappearance of drink, but the temperance in its use. It is the excess that is cut out, not the drink.

The Temperance Movement does not aim to encourage moderation in drinking, and it is not to be supposed that it has brought it about without aiming at it. It has aimed to eliminate drink; and drink is in evidence everywhere. How, then, shall we account for the lessening intemperance? for the fact that workingmen are about as prompt at their work Monday morning as any other day of the week? for the fact that intoxication is so very rare among business and professional men, even in their hours off? A hundred years ago it was no great sin to get drunk. A man did not lose caste by it. But today he does; and, if he offend often, he is banned, both in society and business. How has all this come about?

II

To answer this question satisfactorily, we must first know from what causes intemperance

springs; and the principal of these a careful examination will, I think, show to be as follows.—

I.—Idleness.—The idle rich drink to excess because they do not know what else to do. The idle poor drink to excess; some because they cannot find work, and so seek to forget their troubles; and some are lazy, like the idle rich.

II.—Overwork.—Some rich men overwork from ambition; some poor men, from necessity. In both cases, exhausted nature, in lieu of rest, demands a stimulant; and the stimulant is pretty sure to be abused.

III.—The dulness and monotony of life.—People will have relaxation. If wholesome relaxation is not available, it is always easy and interesting to get drunk. This cause is active in country places more than in the city. Prohibiting drink, in these situations, only adds to the zest of the drink the zest of the chase.

IV.—Troubles, anxieties, losses, afflictions.—Men seek escape from them in drink. This is a prolific source of intemperance.

V.—Malnutrition.—Men and women poorly nourished find a false strength in alcohol.

VI.—To physiological deficiencies.—Nature has formed some people perverse, abnormal, awry. Almost anything may be expected of them, except what is reasonable. If it is not intemperance, it is something else. These people do not go wrong, because they get drunk. They get drunk, because they are wrong, to start with.

Now the nature of the appropriate cure in each item of the above analysis is clear; for idleness,

work; for overwork, rest; for tedium, varied and healthful interests; for malnutrition, a sufficiency of good food; for abnormality, a toning-up of the whole community, physically and morally, and a supervision of the unfit.

III

Now in all these directions the Church can do something; but in none, everything. The conditions ramify widely and penetrate deeply. They involve problems of capital and labor, child labor, woman's labor, factory conditions, tenement house conditions, food prices and purity, rents, taxation; and many others; which the Church was neither empowered nor commissioned to judge of directly and concretely. The church is out of its element, when it sets up as political economist, and presumes to decide among conflicting policies; for, in these things, it knoweth "not which shall prosper, whether this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good" (Ecc. 11.6); or alike bad. On the other hand, in degree as the church attends to its spiritual task successfully, will the spirit of justice and charity permeate and shape legislation and industry, as a living and potent principle. This "pure" religion, indeed, has had its share in reducing intemperance, through the general improvement in manners and morals to which it has contributed in the last hundred and fifty years. Profanity, for example, is less common than it was. So is smutty language. Society, too, is more sensitive to cruelty and injustice practised on its weaker members.

But even more potent than religion, for temperance, are the natural forces in modern society that are constantly, like an acid, eating into and disintegrating the basal causes. Far the greatest of these forces is business. A hundred years ago a man would take the stage from New York to Philadelphia. If the driver was tipsy, it did not make so much difference: some passenger could handle the lines as well as he. At worst, an upset meant only some bruises, and a few dollars' damage,—possibly a horse broke its leg.

Today that stage-driver is a locomotive engineer. On his efficiency depend hundreds of lives, hundreds of thousands of dollars of property, and perhaps a million dollars in damage suits. Sobriety in that engineer is indispensable.

Again, industry is inter-related today. The old-time shoemaker might get drunk: only a customer was incommoded. Today, in the factory, if workman No. 1 is away drunk, no product is handed over to workman No. 2; No. 2 hands none over to No. 3; nor No. 49 to No. 50. If one cog is wrong, the whole machine stops. This means serious loss; and No. 1 positively must not get drunk.

Competition is keen. Mind and body must be kept at their best. There is no place in business for the intemperate. He is unfit. He must go.

Third; organized labor has powerfully promoted temperance.

By reducing excessive toil, it has reduced the abnormal demand for stimulants. By raising wages, it has provided better food, clothes, homes, not only for its members, but for the whole labor-

ing class. Less work and more money, too, open out wholesome ambitions and prospects. By excluding children of tender years from industrial drudgery, it enables their minds to be educated and their bodies to grow; so that, when men and women, they are sound and fit. By sick and death benefits, by old age and out-of-work relief, whether from union or employer, fear for what will happen, when they are incapacitated, is removed. Now "fear hath torment"; which tends to excess in drink.

The struggle with their powerful foe teaches self-restraint. Success teaches self-respect. Both promote class pride. And all three make for temperance.

Thus both halves of industrial society, labor and capital, have a powerful interest in temperance. Is it any wonder that it has made headway?

Again; the commercializing of society, with much bad, has some good. Rich men who formerly wasted their lives in sport or vice are now expected to work; and, with exceptions, they do. In consequence, they keep temperate.

IV

Now in all these secular motives the church has not much place. Nevertheless the resulting situation concerns her, for it offers a danger and an opportunity. Here is the danger: this prudential temperance, being a simulacrum of the church's and the Gospel's, may be accepted in place of it, and thus the church be drawn off her own field to the world's, by the lure of quick and easy re-

turns. Then the church turns physician, chemist, politician, political economist, agitator, office-seeker. Read, for example, the following passages from a sermon, preached by a Christian minister, in a Christian pulpit, on the Christian holy day, in an historic New England church,—a sermon whose wide circulation shows a wide approval.

"Science has demonstrated that alcohol is always and only a poison. Great physicians proclaim it the 'race-poison'. It is necessary to enlarge on this point a little. Many persons think that a moderate use of alcohol liquor is healthful, or at least not injurious. I have thought so for years. I have been compelled to change my view on that point. A moderate quantity of alcohol in a healthy organism acts as a poison and is injurious. Such is the testimony of science.

"Let me give you some of the ways in which this is proved. There is the experiment of time-reaction. I am asked, let us say, when I see a flash of light, to put out my hand toward it. Between seeing the flash and putting out my hand an interval of time necessarily elapses. That interval is called time-reaction. It has been proved that a very moderate quantity of alcohol affects this time-reaction unfavorably, slows down the nervous action, retards the response the nerves make to the demand for movement. Thus a duelist or fencer who had taken a glass of port wine would be slower in offense and defense, would be seriously handicapped. It is the nature of alcohol to paralyze the motor nerve centers. This

has been proved beyond all doubt by strictest experiments in psychological laboratories.

"It has been demonstrated by experiment that if a clerk takes a moderate amount of beer or wine, he cannot add figures as quickly or accurately the next day. It has been demonstrated by experiments in the armies of the world that a soldier cannot shoot as accurately after he has taken a moderate amount of drink. These rigorous tests led President Eliot of Harvard recently in a speech before the Massachusetts No-License league to assert that the 'habitual use of alcohol even in moderate quantities is inexpedient because it lowers the nervous and intellectual power of the human being'.

"And now let me try to state what a body of scientific experimenters, among whom Metchnikoff, 'the chief ornament of the Pasteur institute at Paris', may be cited as most eminent, have demonstrated about certain physiological effects of alcoholic liquor.

"In every drop of our blood there are millions of red cells and thousands of white cells. These white cells are soldiers. When the bacilli of disease invade the body the white cells attack them, enfold them, and devour them. Hence Professor Metchnikoff calls them phagocytes, or eating-cells. Our health and strength, our power to resist and throw off disease, depends on keeping these white cells normal. Now what is the effect of alcohol on the white cells? It paralyzes them. The army of defense becomes literally drunk. This is why drinking men almost always succumb to pneu-

monia. This, too, is the reason why physicians no longer use alcohol in pneumonia. Nobody can ever tell the hosts that have died through the ignorant administration of alcoholic liquors in fevers.

"Not less interesting is the effect of alcohol on the red cells of the blood. What makes them red is a chemical compound called haemoglobin. Its business is to pick up the oxygen in the lungs and distribute it to every living cell in the body. The union between oxygen and haemoglobin in its normal state is very loose; in its alcoholized state, very "tight". Alcohol glues them together so that the red cells of the blood stream can no longer deliver their oxygen. Consequently combustion partially ceases in the body. A drunken man is mortally cold. A beer drinker grows obese because the tissue which ought to be burned up is not burned up. Normal heat being absent exposes the body to disease. Waste accumulates. The liver gives out, the kidneys give out, the stomach gives out. It has been said that beer having so little alcohol is harmless. Beer has 10 per cent of alcohol. An accomplished beer drinker will consume one gallon of alcohol in beer in twenty-four hours.

"It is a well-known fact that if a novice takes a little alcohol it goes at once to his head. What does that mean? The highest stratum of consciousness is the faculty of judgment and self-control. The psychologists speak of the nerve centers of inhibition—inhibition meaning self-control. Alcohol has this characteristic action on these nerve centers—it paralyzes them".

This preacher uses the pulpit and the Lord's day

to teach just how alcohol acts on the human system. He correlates these various actions with one another; and, applying them to the several situations and the varying needs of the human body, he deduces that alcohol as a beverage is always hurtful, and only hurtful.

This is a verdict of such commanding importance that, if announced by even the greatest medical authority in the world, we should still feel it our duty to check it up, if possible, by other authorities in this field; much more so, then, when we have only the word of a clergyman for it. We laymen in this field naturally turn first to the Encyclopaedia Britannica. The article Temperance, in the 11th edition, is by Arthur Shadwell, M.A., M.D., LL.D., Member of the Council of the Epidemiological Society; author of "The London Water Supply"; of "Industrial Efficiency"; of "Drink, Temperance, and Legislation";—a man of science indeed; who has spent years in the study of the drink question. And this is what Dr. Shadwell says, toward the close of his Encyclopaedia article.—

"The existence of a broad relation between superior vigor and an inclination for alcoholic drinks was pointed out years ago by the writer; drinking peoples are noticeably more energetic and progressive than non-drinking ones. It is the universal experience of ship-masters that British seamen, whose intemperance causes trouble and therefore induces a preference for more sober foreigners, exhibit an energy and endurance in emergency of which the latter are incapable. Similar testimony

has repeatedly been borne by engineers and contractors engaged in large works in the South of Europe. . . . It is legitimate and desirable to emphasize the evils, but not by the one-sided and fallacious handling of facts. Alcoholic excess produces the evils alleged, though not to the extent alleged, but there is no evidence to show that its moderate use produces any of them. . . . To draw the inference that alcoholic liquors taken in moderation and consumed in the body have any such action [as in the tissue of a toper] is wholly fallacious. In point of fact, we know that they have not. But there is more than that. These experiments only take cognizance of alcohol; they ignore the other substances actually consumed along with it. Some of these, and notably sugar, are recognized foods; the balance of opinion on the vexed question whether alcohol itself is a food is now on the side of alcohol. But in addition to the principal constituents, easily separable by analysis, are many other substances of which science takes no cognizance at all; they are not identified. Many may be in minute quantities, yet extremely powerful, as are many other vegetable extractives. We know that they exist by their taste and effect, . . . vastly important to the human organism. Another group of experiments are equally fallacious in a different way. The effect of alcohol in mental operations is tested by the comparative speed and ease with which work is done after a dose and without it. The effect has been found to be diminished speed and ease; but those experimenters do not apply the same

test to a good meal or a sound sleep or hard exercise. The writer finds in concentrated mental work that the immediate effect of even a small dose of alcohol is to impair efficiency; but the other three do so in a much higher degree. The inference is not that those are injurious, but that the proper time for each is not just before work; after work he finds them all, alcohol included, beneficial. [Recall Clement of Alexandria's recommendation of drink 'towards evening, when we are no longer engaged in serious work'.] The mortality statistics are treated in a similar one-sided way. They clearly show the injury done by the abuse of alcohol, but what of its moderate use? Agricultural laborers are the most typical modern drinking class, and they are one of the healthiest, in spite of exposure, bad housing, and poverty. If all the unhealthiness of those who drink hard is referred to their drink, then the healthiness of those who drink moderately should be referred to it too.

"The absolute condemnation of alcoholic drinks has never been endorsed by public opinion or by the medical profession, because it is contradicted by the general experience. . . . It is equally undeniable that many derive benefit from a moderate amount of alcoholic drink. Sir William Paget, than whom no man was more completely master of his appetites or better qualified to judge, drank port wine himself because he found that it did him good. He represents the attitude of the medical profession as a whole and of temperate men in general".

So much for the Encyclopaedia Britannica on drink. Now just a word as to what this clergyman says of the amount of alcohol in beer,—to-wit: "Beer has 10 per cent of alcohol. An accomplished beer-drinker will consume one gallon of alcohol in beer in twenty-four hours".

But the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th Edition, says,—article "Beer",—"The general run of beers contain from 3% to 6% of alcohol". But this is of British beers. It presents an analytical table of American beers, which shows a materially lower alcoholic content, falling as low, indeed, as 2.68 per cent. At this rate, our "accomplished beer drinker", to maintain his record of "one gallon of alcohol in twenty-four hours", would have to drink about 40 gallons of beer, say a barrel a day!

Had not the cobbler better stick to his last?

V

There, then, is the danger to the church in the advance of prudential temperance,—that it will set up as an authority in things prudential. But the situation offers its opportunity too. Whatever the progress of temperance through prudential forces, much remains to be done; for there is still a great, though diminishing, deal of intemperance. Here is where the church can teach men the sympathy of Christ with all the normal appetites, as against excess and rigorism alike. In fact, the church itself is none the worse for this reminder; for it, as well as the world, is apt to forget that the whole man, with all his homely, daily, fleshly

experiences, is "holy unto the Lord"; or should be. At the same time, it can advise and warn that, for some, the total denial of some of these cravings is best.

The Catholic Total Abstinence societies in this country are admirable examples of what the church should do, and where it should stop, in this matter of intemperance. These societies urge all to take the pledge who feel that it would be to their spiritual or physical advantage; but there is no censure of those who view their duty otherwise. In fact, many of these societies admit temperate drinkers to associate membership. I have seen a parish gathering in the C. T. A. hall, where, at the close, refreshments were served; the same trays carried "soft" drinks and beer; each helped himself,—the members of the society to their soft drinks; others, as they preferred;—each employing the liberty wherewith Christ had made him free in the way his conscience and judgment dictated; and each recognizing an equal liberty in the others;—as admirable an exemplification of right reason, Christian principle, and true temperance as I have ever seen.

A feature of the Catholic Total Abstinence Society, equally beautiful and effective, is its bringing total abstinence, for those who choose it, under the Christian motive. The pledge begins: "I promise, with the divine assistance, and in honor of the Sacred Thirst and Agony of our Savior", etc.

Besides these C. T. A. Societies, the priests administer a pledge to those who abuse alcoholic

beverages to abstain from such beverages for a period of three months, six months, a year, or five years. Sometimes they administer a pledge not to drink in saloons or public places, but to confine themselves to "a pint of beer" at meals or before retiring.

Let me cite here another association having the same motive, to abolish the evils connected with drink, and, like it, relying for this on the plain old time principles and precepts of the old-time Bible and Church. It is known as "The True Temperance Association", with headquarters in London. It is undenominational, and among its members are many very eminent men, clerical and lay; such as the Right Hon. Alfred Lyttleton, Sir Charles Wyndham, Archdeacon Bevan, Archdeacon Sinclair, Canon Knox Little, Canon Hensley Henson, G. K. Chesterton, Archdeacon Oldham.

Note this among the aims of the Association:

"To encourage the development of the public house in the direction of making it, in the best sense, a place for the present-day social needs of the people, and to help in the removal of all legislative and administrative hindrances to such developments".

It makes, also, this striking declaration:

"In the forefront of its program . . . in the effort to get rid of intemperance the publican [saloon-keeper] must not be treated as an enemy, but as a valuable ally. . . . If we frankly take him into our counsels and ask his help, instead of treating him as a pariah and a public nuisance, the

work of temperance reform will be vastly aided".

"A public house should be a place for the provision of meals, if desired, and also for social amusement. . . . If amusements were plentiful, there would be less excessive drinking. . . . The public house should develop into a real public house, a place of social usefulness and innocent pleasure, wherein, because of its useful and pleasant features, intemperance in drink would be most effectively discountenanced. . . .

"The True Temperance Association hopes that before long there will be scarce a public house in the country from which music will be absent, and it hopes to see the owners of licensed houses vying with each other in the provision, not merely of gramophones and automatic pianos, but of the best available music,—an entertainment which will have the refreshing and elevating influence upon listeners which good music always exercises".

Here are some passages from a sermon circulated by this Association,—a sermon preached by the Rev. Forbes Phillips, vicar of Gorleston Parish Church: "The public house is a need. It is an effect rather than a cause. It was never meant to be merely a drinking-place, but a real house of refreshment, clean, bright, sanitary, cheerful; certainly not a place to be regarded with suspicion and as the target of abuse. Religion must not be degraded to call God's good gifts the "Devil in solution". . . . A gross libel is uttered upon the Founder of our Faith when such things are said. . . . Mr. Gladstone said, 'How can I who drink good wine and bitter beer every day of

my life, in a comfortable room and among friends, coolly stand up and advise hard-working fellow-creatures to take the pledge?' "

From another sermon,—by the Rev. H. R. Gamble, Rector of Holy Trinity Church, Sloane St., S. W., London,—also circulated by the Association,—I extract:

"Those who want a religion which forbids the use of wine and all alcoholic liquors can have it; but the religion is not Christianity. It is Mohammedanism. . . . But suppose that in some way all the strong drink in the country were destroyed, it does not, in the least, follow that, from a Christian standpoint, there would be any gain. No mere negative reform is of much moral value. Our Lord once warned us of the peril of 'the empty house'. . . . I do not believe it would be desirable to make this a nation of teetotalers, if we could. The desire for drink is an instinct to be guided, not extinguished.

"The aim of Christianity is not to work more from without, but from within,—not to cultivate temperance or purity as isolated virtues, but to produce *men* to whom purity or temperance will be a necessary part of the Christian life. . . . It strives to give them 'a clean heart' and 'a right spirit', believing that when this is done all else will follow in due time. . . . Christianity aims at producing character, and character is the expression of the whole man. The danger of cultivating any particular virtue, such as temperance, by itself is that, when this aim is accomplished, other parts of the man's nature may be left en-

tirely unchanged. The most common example of this danger, perhaps, is seen in the violent and aggressive teetotaler, who often seems to have attained his particular object at the cost of his character as a whole. He is often lop-sided and unbalanced. . . . Even temperance is dearly bought at the cost of character as a whole. . . . We must trust men and women as free and responsible beings, capable of 'self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control'."

The President, the Right Hon. the Earl of Halsbury, declared, "The public house ought to be a place where a man can go with his wife". He quoted a letter from Lord Roberts, commander of the army, who told how much had been accomplished for true temperance in the Indian army by the canteen. Sir Alfred Cripps quoted the Bishop of Birmingham as recommending to his countrymen the sort of public café that he had lately observed in Spain.

The Association "believes that, for the mass of mankind, sound alcoholic beverages, drunk in moderation, are not only harmless, but positively beneficial".

Canon Hensley Henson said: "There is no evidence available in the history of mankind to justify us in believing that the inhabitants of the temperate, the subarctic, and the arctic zones are ever likely to be able to conduct their ordinary life on the basis of total abstinence. . . . Drink will in the future, as in the past, be one of the fixed elements of the social order in these latitudes. . . . There is real danger of associating

Christianity and total abstinence so closely as to throw into revolt against Christianity that large volume of reason and of custom in our countrymen which repudiates the habits and policy of total abstinence, . . . total abstinence putting a burden on the necks of our countrymen which neither we nor our forefathers were able to bear".

Professor W. E. Dixon, M.D., of Cambridge University, stated that his whole life had been spent in the investigation of the action of drugs and poisons, and that his laboratory had already published many researches on alcohol. Dr. Dixon asserted that all reliable evidence indicates that alcohol is not a poison; "in moderation it is a food, because it yields the body useful energy".

Archdeacon Sinclair gave it as his judgment that militant teetotalers had merely taken up an ancient heresy.

The Rev. A. E. Oldroyd not only believed that it was right and Christian to drink, but hoped the time would come when he could enter a public house in his parish without criticism.

The Bishop of Chester wrote in "Chamber's Journal", of December, 1909: "to reform the public house [saloon] is a sounder and more hopeful aim than the policy of prohibition or even mere reduction".

The Bishop of Worcester said, in addressing his Clergy, in September, 1909: "What was wanted was not so much the destruction of public houses as their reform. . . . What the nation wanted was a more frank recognition that some kind of public house [saloon] is a national necessity.

. . . They would be helped to accomplish that more truly by sympathetic than by vindictive legislation".

SUMMARY

At this point, the teaching of Bible and Church about drink having been reviewed, two observations are in order.

First; while at times drink is spoken of as food, still the prevailing view in Bible and Church is that its function is to relax and cheer: it "maketh glad the heart of man". This relaxing of the bodily and mental forces is as normal and wholesome as their concentration and tension. It is so much the better, if this relaxing can be, not merely an automatic reaction, but a cheerful recreation.

Second; our religion undoubtedly posits the healthfulness of drink, rightly used. If science should demonstrate the contrary, namely, that the alcoholic beverage is a poison, it would be a fatal blow to the authority of Jesus Christ. If Jesus practised an indulgence, however ignorantly, that was injurious,—that was destructive,—to body and soul, if he encouraged this indulgence in others, if he, indeed, incorporated it in the holiest rite of his church and religion, to be learned and practised by every disciple of his throughout all the world, till the end of time, then our confidence in him as the Way, the Truth, and the Life is hopelessly shattered. Then, in this thing, his Way is the broad way that leadeth unto destruction; his Truth makes men, not free, but slaves indeed; his Life is not the light,

but the darkness, of men. St. John (2.25) assures us that Jesus "needed not that any one should bear witness concerning man; for he himself knew what was in man". But, if the teetotaler is right, then in this knowledge Jesus needeth that Buddha, that Mohammed, should tell him: for in this they knew, and he did not. The evil that through this his ignorance he sanctioned and sanctified through all these ages is immeasurable, appalling. The conversion of Buddhists and Mohammedans has meant, in this direction, their turning from light unto darkness; for the Church, following Christ, taught them that the aversion to drink was a mere superstition, and put the wine-cup to their lips as a thing "generally necessary to salvation". No! A Savior whose ignorance and blundering have to be corrected by his own disciples will never do.

And, if Christ was mistaken in this, why not in what else he taught?

Yet no disciple of his need be shaken. It is not the first time that Christ has been wounded in the house of his friends,—not the first time nor the fiftieth;—not the first nor the fiftieth, either, that he has suffered despite in the name of "science falsely so called" (1 Tim. 6.20). And, as in the past, so it is now: real science, the science that is science indeed, the science of such men as Dr. Arthur Shadwell and Prof. W. E. Dixon, is vindicating and authenticating (and all the more effectively, because unintended) him who is, not only the Power, but also the Wisdom, of God (1 Cor. 1.24).

PART THREE

THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL

CHAPTER I

RELIGION AND LAW

I

It seems like a truism to say that, for religion, this question of drink is a religious question: yet it needs to be said. Those who, by their office, peculiarly represent religion should, as such, confine themselves to this one interest: Have Bible and Church a message for this specific thing; if so, what is it? This is not to slur the other aspects of the question: possibly they are even more vital and determinative. But they are for other departments and for other men, not for religion and its officers. We clergy resent it, when men of science attempt to lay down the law in matters religious, especially in controverted matters. It is just as wrong for the clergy to pronounce on controverted matters of science. We have seen what a sorry thing pulpit "science" is, discrediting not only the man and the calling, but Church and Religion as well. The whole misunderstanding between science and religion, in fact, has been due to this meddling of each in the things of the other. Science has its sphere; religion has its sphere; occasionally the borders between the two

have to be rectified; each should respect the rights of the other by minding its own business.

I am far from denying, too, that law has its place in the correction of wrong and the promotion of right. But it is not for the church and clergy to say what the law should be. Surely the times past sufficed for that. In these happier days religion may attend to its proper office of speaking to man's conscience and educating his soul. It should tell him what duty is, not what the law should be. The one it knows infallibly; the other perhaps nobody knows. When religion abandons its high function, and enters politics to advocate or oppose a bill, a political measure,—that is, a question of facts, expediency, precedent, judgment (as to all which religion has no special enlightenment),—it forfeits its authority as the organ of the common conscience, and becomes a mere political partisan; whose inevitable next step will be to pull wires, and make deals and intrigues,—in a word, to show itself sharper than its opponents. But it is not good for the church to be sharp. It should be wise and simple.

It is in this matter of law that the church is prone to go wrong. It did indeed once set up as authority on science, also, but it has learned its lesson, and does so no more. Every one now recognizes that the church or the clergyman, as such, rendering a judgment on scientific issues, is an absurdity. But it is not so widely recognized that the church has no more competency to set up as legislator, not a whit more. In view of the general misapprehension on this subject, it will be

worth while to consider the offices of religion and law at some length.

The religion that I have in mind, in what follows, is the religion of Christ, and much that I say would be inapplicable to any other.

Here is the difference between this religion and law.—Law looks over the man. It says, "He has murdered nobody; he has robbed nobody; he has libelled nobody. I find no fault in him". But religion does not look over him; it looks within him, and says, "Murder was in his heart; he is a murderer. Robbery was in his heart; he is a robber. He thought the slander; therefore he committed it. He looked on a woman to lust after her; therefore he hath committed adultery already with her".

It is not so much that the law judges by externals; but it judges of externals. It knows only what the man does; and it cares for what he is only so far as this may determine what he will do. The deed's the thing. But with religion the thought's the thing, and the deed is only an incident of it. That is, a man may do things that offend, with little, or even no, wrong in his heart, —certainly with none commensurate with the legal offence. Again, he may do nothing that offends, and yet be, morally, a monster. The law only demands that the sepulchre be whited: it objects to conditions within only so far as they tend to work through and loosen or blotch the whitening.

Here, then, is the sole concern of law with character: it needs character, to secure the sort of conduct that alone it can work with. Another

thing:—it needs this character, but it cannot evoke it; it will therefore welcome and patronize any agency that can.

Now this thing that law cannot do is religion's specialty: this one thing it does. Yet, even so, it does not do it in the way that law would do it, if it could. The law would build up only that inner character which would come to the surface in the conduct needed at the time for social well-being. Character that did not come to the surface, or that came to the surface in ways not in demand at the time, or even obnoxious, it would not concern itself with. This sort of character might perish, for all the law cared.

Religion may do what law does, but it does it only in doing far more. Its program is not a well ordered society: religion would perish, if it looked only on the things that are seen and temporal. It is not that it ignores these: they do, in fact, enter into its calculations. But it esteems them only for their eternal value, the values that are "not seen". Here is the antithesis: law says, "The spirit for the flesh; eternity for time". For the law cares for neither spirit nor eternity in themselves, but only as enfleshed in time, only as they are here and now. But religion, contrariwise, says, "The flesh for the spirit; time for eternity". Religion, therefore, subordinating the less to the greater, will sacrifice body to soul, time to eternity. But law, knowing nothing greater, will sacrifice this life only for still more of this life, and time only for a longer time,—a question of mere quantitative advantage.

Jesus not only distinguished these two interests, but he named an indication by which any one could distinguish them: "My kingdom", he said (John 18.36), "is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight". That is, force is the mark of the one kingdom; the absence of force, a mark of the other. The club, the bayonet, the gallows, the cell are unknown in the kingdom of the spirit. Wherever you see force used, you may know it is not Christ's kingdom. It may call itself his, but it is not; for his servants do not fight. This, then, is a distinction of religion and law,—the presence or absence of force. Law is not law without it ("Where the law cannot compel it must not command"): religion is not religion with it. Wherever you see force, there is no religion. Wherever you see religion, there is no force. This is not to condemn force: it is only to say that it appertains to Caesar, not Christ.

But the absence of force is freedom. Freedom, then, is a condition of the kingdom of God,—not the kingdom itself, mark, but a condition of it. In that kingdom the man is free. In the kingdom of this world, he is under compulsion.

Is there, then, nothing in Christ's kingdom corresponding with fear and force in the kingdom of this world? Indeed there is,—both fear and force, —but after an heavenly and spiritual manner. It is fear of God, not man; for the soul, not the body; for eternity, not time. And force? "The love of Christ constraineth us" (2 Cor. 5.14).

Thus these two kingdoms, government and re-

ligion, differ in their fields, their ends, their instruments.

But this force which supports law,—whose force is it? Ultimately it is the force that those who assent to the law can bring to bear on those who do not. And the effectiveness of this force varies with the difficulty of the task. Some things law can do easily; some things, with effort; some, with difficulty; some, scarce at all; and some things are so far beyond it that it does not attempt them. Law, for example, can enforce a stamp duty, by invalidating all legal documents not so attested. It can prevent the sale of drink in settled communities without a license. It can stop smuggling by travelers. It can prescribe difficult and costly processes for marriage; as, not long ago, in Porto Rico and the Philippines. Or it can tell people, as it virtually does in New Jersey, that they must not do anything on Sunday but go to church. And, conceivably, the law might command people to be good. Yet all the force in the world would not make people good. Two hundred years ago there were many offences for which a man might be put to death; still it did not make people good. Again; with all its might, the law could not compel people to follow a prescribed religion.

Clearly, then, there is a sphere within which law is effective, and another sphere within which it is ineffective. In this other sphere we cannot conceive any transformation of human nature or human society that would subject it to our law;—and this not alone in high, spiritual things, but in such every-day matters as overeating or over-

dressing or speaking the truth or showing courtesy or rising betimes, and a thousand other like matters.

But even within its own sphere law is not omnipotent. In all governments, and particularly in free governments, it cannot go beyond the judgment and conscience of the community. That judgment and that conscience vary from time to time and from place to place. In Richmond, Virginia, the Sunday-closing law is effective, because the people approve it. In New York it is disregarded, because the people are against it. And, such is the contrariness of human nature, the mere fact that a community votes for a law is no assurance that it believes in it or proposes to obey it; it may be in favor of the law, but against its enforcement. It is one thing to furnish the law, and another to furnish the force needed to ensure obedience. That is why we have so many dead-letter laws in this country,—we forget that a law is not self-enforcing. The ultimate factor is always the amount and effectiveness of the available force.

And is religion to mix itself up with this complex of disputed expediencies and powers, so changeable in its principles, so uncertain in its operations? What passage in its charter so empowers it? What wisdom from on high qualifies it? What example of our Lord justifies it? No; religion has naught to do with all this, except to instruct its followers to be law-abiding citizens or subjects, as long as law does not interfere with their duty to God. It is true that, even outside

such interference, laws may be helpful or prejudicial to religion, indirectly. For example, a law that herds first offenders with hardened criminals in jail makes it difficult for religion to do for those boys or girls what otherwise it might. Likewise, the want of a law (in effect, therefore, a permissive law) regulating hours of labor for the young, and hours and conditions in factories, mines, and hazardous occupations is an obstacle to religion. The question then arises whether organized religion is not, in such instances, justified in approaching the state in the interest of better laws. It is a question that has two sides, though the practice of the church has been one-sided. It may well be that this should all be left to the citizen as citizen. But two or three things in the situation are clear. One is that the church should ask nothing in its own interest or religion's. Another is that it should ask only what the mind of the community is virtually a unit on. A third is that it should not propose measures, but only the ends;—not a particular bill, as to whose sufficiency it has no competency for judging, but some enactment that will stop the evil aimed at.

Even in this much there is grave danger of an entanglement of religion with government. There is the danger that government will seek to use this powerful ally for its selfish, and not always creditable, ends; and there is danger that the church will see in Caesar's legions a short-cut to its own aggrandizement,—both at the sacrifice of religion. Perhaps both church and state would be better

off today, if each had attended strictly to its own business from the beginning.

In this misalliance, candor obliges the admission that the state has sinned less grievously than the church. As a rule, the state recognizes its limitations. The great pagan states never had any interest in religion, except as an element contributing to prosperity and progress; it was a secular religion that they believed in. The Christian state, too, has used religion in the same way: the temporal order secured, the state has had no interest in things spiritual. As to all these matters it has been a Gallio (Acts 18.17);—indifferent, easy-going, tolerant. Left to itself, it is little disposed to intrude into private conduct or matters touching the conscience. It is only when the church gets control of the secular power that the dark days come, with their tortures and death and banishment and outlawry for offences purely spiritual. A church using carnal weapons is not only worse than the state; it is worse than no church at all. The worst church, minding, however poorly, its spiritual business, is far superior to the best church, with its finger in politics. This was, at bottom, the thought of a Russian statesman in his objection to the separation of church and state: he said that the church, free and independent, would soon come to exercise a galling tyranny over both government and society. Be it remembered that it was a political church which coerced the unwilling state to put Jesus to death.

And all this is in the nature of things. Just

because the interests of the state are so few and so modest, to-wit, worldly well-being, a modest conformity satisfies it. Let a man obey the laws, —he can live and feel and strive and agonize outside of this, he can live fifty lives of his own, for all of the state. The part of his life that the state cares for may be so insignificant, in comparison with the rest, as hardly to be worth reckoning; yet in all this larger part he is free, and the state will maintain him in that freedom, against all aggressors.

But religion looks to no mere outward conformity. It searches out the deep things of the heart. It "is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4.12). It scrutinizes, feels, weighs, tests, appraises things that the state does not so much as know exist. This is religion's proper office. Now take this subtle, searching, ubiquitous agent out of its own sphere of thoughts, feelings, fears, doubts, hopes, reproaches, gratitudes, aspirations, confessions, adorations; put a club into its hands, and say, "With this, rule man's outward life"; and what will you get? You will pervert religion into a monster; and with it you will bedevil society. Jesus, who could presently summon to his aid more than twelve legions of angels, but who submitted, rather than overcome force by force, has lived in vain, if his church sets itself to playing Caesar, and summoning, not angels, but spies and strong-arm men, to

do its work. The very pervasiveness and ubiquity of its proper office becomes a terrible tyranny, when applied to outward conduct and enforced by fines and blows. A political church is the betrayal of Christ with a kiss. How often must the experiment of theocracy be tried, and come to disastrous end, before the church will learn its lesson, "My kingdom is not of this world"? Whenever you see a church entering politics, you see a church leaving religion. And when you hear a religious organization boasting that it is "the greatest political force in the country", you hear a Christianity "glorying in its shame". The children of this world are, in their generation, wise enough to attend to their own business: why cannot the children of light be as wise? Or is it that

> "The churchman fain would kill his church,
> As the churches killed their Christ"?

Is it, then, that the church, in dictating or administering the law of the state, is too harsh, too thoroughgoing, too compelling,—in a word, too effective? No, indeed; its tyranny is the least part of its offence: here is the thing,—it is cruel and inefficient. It is not "the strong man"; it is only the strong fool. Its failure is as pitiful as its tyranny is shameful. It sins and fails. It is on this very point,—the failure of the law to make men good,—that St. Paul fastens. He comes back to it again and again. He never tires of preaching the impotence of the law, in contrast with the might and majesty of the spirit. Let the writ-

ten law be never so thoroughgoing in its prohibitions, and fierce in its threatenings, even to the lash and faggot;—yet St. Paul assures us that, whatever the police force back of it, it can never make men the thing Christ came into the world to make them: it may make them law-abiding, outwardly: it cannot make them Christian: "If there had been a law given which could make alive, verily righteousness would have been of the law" (Gal. 3.21). But this inward deliverance is just "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh" (Rom. 8.3). There it is,—the remarkable thing about the law, for the things of Christ, is not its inflexibility nor its peremptoriness:—in these it is exceeded by the new law of Christ, searching out the deep things of the heart:—the remarkable thing about the law, for the things of Christ, is its weakness,—its weakness and failure. It demands, but does not enable; accordingly the more exacting it is, the more of a failure it is. It is only by asking little that it can get anything. Not only was the law "cold, inert, passive. It pointed severely to the path of right and duty, but there its function ended; it gave no help toward the performance of what it required"; but "by a certain strange perversity in human nature, it seemed actually to provoke to disobedience. The very fact that a thing was forbidden seemed to make its attractions all the greater" (Rom. 7.8). "And this was equally true of the individual and of the race; the better and fuller the law, the more glaring was the contrast to the practice

of those who lived under it. The Jews were at the head of all mankind in their privileges, but morally they were not much better than the Gentiles. In the course of his travels St. Paul was led to visit a number of the scattered colonies of Jews; and, when he compares them with the Gentiles, he can only turn on them a biting irony (Rom. 2.17-29). The truth must be acknowledged; as a system, Law of whatever kind had failed. The break-down of Jewish Law was most complete, because that law was the best'' (Sanday and Headlam, ''Romans'', in International Critical Commentary, page 188).

It is true that the law which St. Paul pronounces so weak and ineffective in the sphere of religion, because it could not make ''alive'', was, in his immediate thought, the Mosaic Law; but not exclusively. ''He deals with it rather as the classic type of law in religion: it is really law as law . . . that he has in mind'' (Enc. Brit. ''Paul the Apostle'', page 941b). ''The principle here asserted applies to every authoritative prescription of conduct'' (J. Agar Beet, ''St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans'', page 189). ''Paul was the pioneer who secured mankind forever against bondage to religious legalism'' (Enc. Brit. ''Paul'', page 941b). It was not that law was not needed: it was only that it was not needed in religion. Elsewhere it had its place. St. Paul even describes it as ''holy, righteous, and good'' (Rom. 7.12), in its proper place. If it had no other function, it would still serve, indirectly, to check spiritual extravagances, such as have at times dis-

figured Christian history; when, in the name of the spirit, men have thrown off all restraint as to the body. The law sharply reminds these that any religion which comes short of the works of the law is thereby condemned as not of Christ.

What, then, under the Gospel, takes the place of law? This: "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new" (2 Cor. 5.17). "As, to the Jew, life was lived under the Law or in it as native element, so the Christian life was "in Christ", as element or law of being (Enc. Brit. "Paul", page 941c). Under the state, obedience is demanded for an impersonal thing, law: this regimen, in fact, prides itself on being "a government of laws, not of men"; and it rightly insists on this. But in Christ it is the very reverse: instead of an impersonal and mechanical law, made up of "Don'ts" and "Musts", we have an adorable Person. In the one case we obey because of fear or self-interest or conscience: in the other "the love of Christ constraineth us". The one principle starts from without. The other is so wholly inward that it is not so much even the external, historical Christ that dominates the Christian as it is the living, spiritual, present "Christ in you" (Col. 1.27). Accordingly St. Paul does not scruple to say: "Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more" (2 Cor. 5.16). And his best prayer for those whom he addresses is, "that ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man; that Christ may dwell

in your hearts through faith'' (Eph. 3.16-17). St. Paul was the first man, known to history, who proposed to the world, as the basis of life, devotion to a person instead of devotion to a principle. Herein he rightly discerned the heart of Christ's Gospel, with its ''Come unto me''; and this is his originality and preeminence.

But the Gospel, in this, as in all else, has its roots in the Old Testament. The seer who wrote of the Messiah, ''He will not cry, nor lift up his voice'' (Is. 42.2), had a clearer vision of the truth of the Gospel of Christ than multitudes of 20th Century Christians. For these words, ''He will not cry, nor lift up his voice'', mean that the Messiah's ''methods shall be purely inward and spiritual, contrasting with the imperious will of an Elijah and the destructive agency of a Cyrus'' (Cheyne).

This central feature of the Gospel of Christ is well summed up by Prof. Otto Pfleiderer, in discussing the place of Robertson in the religious thought of England. He says: ''Faith is the life of Christ begun in us, which God counts as righteousness, because, as the divine life in the soul, it is the root and spring of righteousness. As the inward principle of a morally good will, it sets us free from external laws, which can only incite to transgression or produce conventional legality'' (Development of Theology, Book 4, Chapter 2, page 385).

Law, then, aims to keep the man from doing certain things, and to make him do certain other things. But that is not religion's interest. Re-

ligion's interest is to make the man himself different, so that he will wish to do certain things and to refrain from other things, because the love of Christ so constraineth him. The difference between religion and law is the difference between being and doing. A man may fully satisfy the law, and yet be dead before God. Again, he may, in a matter of right conscience, transgress the law, and yet be "alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord". It is not that religion is indifferent to conduct; but it affects conduct by affecting the heart; out of which "are the issues of life" (Pro. 4.23).

For example, there is this matter of intemperance. The interest of the state is that the man stay sober. Its inducements are several, direct and indirect; and they are more or less effective. Among them is a law, backed by force. Religion, too, desires that the man stay sober; but its inducement is only one, and that one just a sentiment, the love of Christ and the desire to be like him. Insufficient, sentimental,—you say? Yet the history of the ages demonstrates this: "Every one that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself, even as he is pure" (1 John 3.3). Yes; granted: "Every one that hath this hope": but what of the multitudes that have not this hope, and cannot be brought to have it? Why, just this: the church has naught to do with them, except to strive and pray that it may be born in their hearts. This is its one task; beyond this it has no commission, no power, no competency, no responsibility. Those that will not hear, it

judges not; but it has nothing else to offer them, —nothing but the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Son of God and Savior of the world. The state may look after them, as it looks after us all; but the church knows only its living Lord.

Nor is religion indifferent to temporal things. There is, indeed, a religion that detaches itself from this world, as "the tomb of the soul". Again, there is a religion that merges itself in this world, as the only certitude. But Christ's religion does neither. It sets to work "to build up a new kingdom grounded in the purely inward life, but working with mighty effect in the visible sphere" (Eucken, "What Is Christianity?" page 82). Religion (like reason) has emerged very late in human evolution; but, though last come, it is in prerogative "the first-born of every creature" (over every created thing). Yet it is so only by living its own "purely inward life".

It may be that the commingling of church and state through the ages was an inevitable depravation: this is only to say that the Gospel lived and wrought, for that period, unorganized, in the hearts of faithful individuals. It looks at times as if this were so still. And, indeed, that secularized church had fruits to show, pleasant to the eyes, of its forbidden union; for the greatest statesmen of the world were all in it, and all served it, and did many mighty works, after their kind. But today they do not serve it in their capacity as statesmen. In that capacity they serve the state; where they belong. Therefore, when the church today essays a political role, it is apt to

be impotent, or foolish, or evil. Bethink you of a ministerial association's attempting to purify politics by running its own "civic righteousness" municipal ticket; and of the results, pitiful and ludicrous. It is true that the church in politics sometimes becomes a formidable power; but then, too, its want of great minds, with grasp and vision and balance, is painfully evident. The greatest minds of today are in the church; but they are not in church politics. And all that the church gains in political influence it loses, and more, in spiritual influence. When it is talking politics, it is not preaching Christ. And what the world needs is more Christ and less politics; more love and less hate; more faith, and less suspicion.

The first thing in any vital reform, from the Christian point of view, is not law: the last thing is law. The first thing is the conquest of the spirit; and often enough this first thing is all that is needed. The effort to actualize the Christian ideal by law misses the whole secret of Christ's Gospel. It coarsens and secularizes religion, and makes law fanatical, hypocritical, tyrannical, corrupt. It is the old mistake of the multitudes who would seize Christ by force and make him king. Time and again should the Christian call to mind these words, "What the law could not do, in that it was weak"; for this Christ does in us because he is strong,—mighty, invincible, conquering and to conquer,—not by the club, but through the might of adoring love. Why, even a lesser attachment, as to parent or wife or child, as to art or science or athletics or even to money-getting, will

do much to withhold a man from many forms of excess or hurt. How much more the sympathetic identification of oneself with Christ, so that "it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2.20). The fruit of this Spirit "is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control" (Gal. 5.22). Can the fruits of the law compare with these? And note that last named virtue, self-control. This is nothing but the temperance that we are seeking: only it is a temperance, not outwardly, from fear or interest, but of the heart, rooted and grounded in religion. This very virtue that we are now so intent on is, according to St. Paul, a fruit of the Spirit, that Spirit which is life, that life which is life indeed. No law ever gave birth to it. No fear ever nourished it. No force ever restrained its wandering steps. It begins, continues, and ends in the adoring love of Christ. This is Christian temperance, or self-control, and it is the only kind that the church has a right to be interested in. It is certain that the church cannot be interested in it and in legal temperance at the same time. Therefore it is that, if religion enter politics, in the interest of temperance, it must soon give over its spiritual function. It becomes bad religion, to be bad law. Christian temperance should begin by working with the individual; and then organize individuals into associations, pledged to seek and to save their weak brothers, in the name and power of Christ. But it can not carry on politics and religion at the same time. In fact, the institution that can do

this is not yet born. No eye (but One) can scrutinize both inside and outside at once. Inevitably such a religion sinks to a religion of legalism, ending in a residuum of external "Don'ts", backed by legal violence. Such a religion more and more inclines to know nothing among men save the law written. Its view is that Christ is helpless without a written law, backed by a club;—Christ dependent on Caesar, the spirit on the flesh, eternity on time, God on man. This is what comes, and must come, of tying up the church with government, religion with law.

The routine of law and usage and public opinion often keeps a man straight, though he have not the inward power. But let that man be taken out of this familiar fabric into other social conditions, where he is not borne upon by these influences, and see how external and inorganic all this outward law is. Men coming out of the settled conditions of Europe to America, or going from our Eastern states to mining districts of the West, soon show the nature of the constraint that held them. The outward convention, the "law", is cast off, like old clothes; but the heart that was God's knows no change.

It is sad to see those churches that arose as a protest against state religion, which were loud for freedom in things spiritual, now that they are free, themselves invoking, through political activity, the state to come to their aid,—"the united churches in action, the greatest political force in the country". It looks as if their real grievance

had been that the lash was on their back instead of in their hand.

A truly Christian people, making up a political community, would be least of all inclined to enact their religion into law. As citizens of a secular state, they would frame their legislation wholly from the secular point of view, with only secular ends, with only secular instruments, with only secular sanctions.

"You cannot make a man good by law" is a common saying, sometimes scoffed at. But those who know and understand it have the secret of the Gospel; as the scoffers do not.

Spiritual men of all branches of the church, Catholic and Protestant, ought to say Amen to the following noble words of the great Baptist preacher, Charles H. Spurgeon, of London:

YOUR SUNDAY BILLS AND ALL OTHER FORMS OF ACT-OF-PARLIAMENT RELIGION SEEM TO ME TO BE ALL WRONG. GIVE US A FAIR FIELD AND NO FAVOR, AND OUR FAITH HAS NO CAUSE TO FEAR. CHRIST WANTS NO HELP FROM CAESAR. I SHOULD BE AFRAID TO BORROW HELP FROM THE GOVERNMENT. IT WOULD LOOK TO ME AS IF I RESTED ON AN ARM OF FLESH, INSTEAD OF DEPENDING ON THE LIVING GOD.

II

The attitude of the church in this country toward those who sell drink is not in accord with the way of Christ. A portion of the church, though the smaller portion, has approached this class with a curse and a blow; and the larger portion has not approached it at all. No consider-

able portion of the church has even attempted to see what could be done in a spirit of sympathy and love. This class of men have yet to be approached in the way in which they should have been approached at the beginning; that is, as brethren in Christ; and appealed to to cooperate in the freeing of the traffic from wrong. Instead, they have been reviled with curses, and beaten with many stripes, in the name of Christ. But no man is won that way; and no man is made to hate his wrong that way; no man,—not you nor I. Let the church even now, late as it is, go to these brethren, and say: "Let us work together, in a spirit of cooperation, to make this business clean and good, for Christ's sake, who came 'drinking'; who himself drank, and made drink for the guests at the marriage feast; who, on the night in which he was betrayed, gave drink to his apostles, and established the wine-cup on the altar of every church, till his coming again".

Would they ignore this invitation? They have had no chance to accept it. But it is our duty, as the church of Christ, to do this much, if we do aught; and, when it is rejected, it will be time enough to ask what next. Perhaps this is as far as we ought to go. It surely is too odious to think of Christ's church's acting as spy or policeman for the state. If men who deal in drink prove obdurate in wrong-doing, it is for the state, not the church, to deal with them temporally. Let Caesar pronounce the curse, and swing the club. Even the medieval Inquisition, in handing its victim over to the secular power for punish-

ment, went through the form of recommending him to mercy. Too often in this country today, it is zealots for religion who, in the name of church and religion, urge and drive the civil magistrate to disgrace and destroy those whom they have spied out and informed against. It is not good to see Christ's church lusting so for blood: "If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another" (Gal. 5.15). This is just what happens, when religion starts in to combat intemperance, not by the might of the spirit, but by force and arms.

Deplorable evils, it is true, have fastened on the drink traffic; and it is the bounden duty of Christians to take note of them. But there is a right and a wrong way of doing it. The wrong way is to curse and smite the whole institution of drink, with its evil and good alike. But not even psychology or ethics, much less our religion, supports us in this way of going about moral reform: they both frown on the proposal to remove a moral evil by simply overpowering it with brute force. The approved doctrine is rather that moral evil springs at bottom from a lawful instinct, which somehow or other loses its way. The remedy is to get it back in the way. Now, drink being right, the traffic cannot in itself be wrong. Where it is wrong, those who lead should show us the wrong, and, what is of equal importance, should show us the right. It does no good for them to stand apart and threaten,—"If you don't reform, we will destroy you". The assumption that this reform is a matter for those only who deal in

drink is fallacious. Every one of us, whether we drink or not, has a duty in the matter; for the guilt is social, the problem is social, the remedy is social. And only those who are as forward to vindicate the right in this concern as to condemn the wrong can be effective. No indiscriminate passion for destruction will answer. Only after intelligence and conscience have set in motion the wholesome influences that by their growth will naturally crowd out what is bad, overcoming evil with good, can law effectively use the club to suppress the laggard and incorrigible. With this part of it, however, religion has nothing to do. What we have to do is to enter into the situation sympathetically, not in order to upset everything, but with our first thought to find and justify and accredit and establish what is innocent and good, and to censure and destroy only in order to this affirmative work. No institution can be reformed by its enemies; only its wise friends can do this. In the words of Prof. Henry Jones (Hibbert Journal, October, 1905),—"The effective reformer must find his fulcrum for raising society in things as they are. He must live within the world, if he is to make it better, and arm himself with its powers, in order to conquer it".

There are, in religion, two ways that, in their start, a hasty glance may not distinguish. The description of them sounds alike to the ear that is not attent. But one is the way of freedom and self-mastery; the other, the way of force and cruelty and bondage.

The first way is this:

If thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire.

And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire (Mat. 18.8-9).

The other way is this:

If thy neighbor's hand or foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for him to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire.

And if thy neighbor's eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: it is better for him to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire.

The first is the way of Jesus.

The second is the way of the rigorist.

CHAPTER II

CHARACTER AND CODDLING

I

The theory of moral prophylaxis issuing in the indiscriminate ban on drink is in sharp contrast with that of the Gospel. The Gospel, with all its tenderness, relies on character; this rigorism, with all its terrors, on coddling. Rigorism's ideal is the insurance of character by systematic, unsleeping, and jealous espionage, in order to keep temptation away, at whatever sacrifice, so that the soul may rest unassailed. But this was not the principle of Jesus,—"Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise" (Mat. 10.16). This wisdom would enable them to choose between the evil and the good. And so the little band went forth, to conquer sin, Satan, and death for the Lord and his Christ. It is an unscriptural principle that makes immunity from struggle,—an easy and safe moral career,—its end. The picture of Christian soldiers lying safe behind their battlements is an ignoble one. "The earth is the Lord's": and it ought to be our pride to go forth and conquer it for him. Not immunity from temptation, but conquest over temptation, is Christ's way.

And here is the danger in the great humanitarian enthusiasm that is sweeping over the world. It is devoting its attention too much to

environment, and too little to character; no doubt, in reaction from the contrary extreme. But

> "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
> But in ourselves, that we are underlings".
> Julius Caesar, 1.2.

Are we not wrongly taking it for granted that character will develop satisfactorily, in the absence of difficulties;—in spite of the fact that most of the greatest characters we know of have developed in the teeth of difficulties? The policy is to make this world safe and comfortable, not through the up-build of conscience and will, but by protective legislation. Everybody together is to do everything, but nobody by himself is to do anything,—except wait for the legislature to make it easy for him to be good. Too many parents are shifting their responsibility to school, church, courts, police. Young persons go wrong largely because their parents have failed in their duty to them. And churches are going wrong in neglecting their function as preachers of righteousness, to take up political agitation. It is seldom that young men and women go to the bad whose parents and whose pastors have properly taught and trained them. It is as true today as it was two thousand years ago that the one sure reliance in the face of moral hazard is moral force; and it will be true to the end of time.

In illustration, read the following letters, which I have clipped from newspapers.

To the Editor:

Will you kindly advise me as to what course I shall pursue concerning a newsdealer who sells my seven-year-old boy cinnamon cigarettes. Is there a law that reaches him or should I consult a lawyer? Your advice will be sincerely appreciated.

MOTHER.

The editor advises this mother to complain to the Court.

The second is from a newspaper of our rural South:

To the Editor:

On looking over your copy of Friday, I was horror struck to see a whiskey advertisement in it. Fortunately my three fine, growing boys had not seen the paper yet, and I destroyed it at once, even though my husband had not read it and would be disappointed. That advertisement might have started my boys on a downward course. How can a mother maintain her influence when such temptations find their way into the very home? Can nothing induce you to stop this wrong?

ANXIOUS MOTHER.

What is this first mother, who needs the police to keep her boy from buying and smoking cinnamon cigarettes, when he is seven years old, going to do with him when he is fourteen? She will have to call out the militia.

And this other mother,—her sons are going to

see whiskey advertisements, and whiskey stores, and whiskey itself, some time. They are going to see other things and places and people far worse. The only way to avoid seeing them is to put their eyes out. What are they going to do then? And what is she going to do then?

Millions and tens of millions of young children keep out of places that they are bid keep out of, because they would not thus disobey their fathers and mothers. They are kept in check by fear and love both. But it is clear that this seven-year-old neither loves nor fears his mother; and there is no reason why he should,—a mother so characterless and helpless as to depend on the complaisance of the storekeeper or the authority of the court to keep her little child out of a forbidden store.

The mistake these mothers make is in thinking that their children's well-being depends on removing every temptation and danger. But, if this were all, they would grow up moral invertebrates. And, besides, even with all outward temptation removed (if such a thing were possible), there would be the temptations imbedded in their own nature,—which no surgery can get at, and which in themselves are enough to wreck their lives,—tempests of passion, infirmities of temper, selfishness.

It is true, indeed, that we should remove temptation of certain sorts or of excessive urgency. For example, we try to keep our children from evil companions. But it is not true that it would be wise to remove all temptation. The stripling will build up his moral thews and bulk

to manhood's proportions by grappling with evil, even at the cost of an occasional fall. He need not, indeed, seek it out: he is not wise enough for that. The routine of life will put him in the way of temptations many and various. Temptation is for the character what discomfort is for the flesh. In general, we avoid bodily discomfort. Yet often we recognize it as an indispensable condition of health, of eminence, of success; as in the training of an athlete.

The main dependence, for our boys and girls, should be in the building up of character,—of principle, of will-power, of conscience,—such as shall carry them through temptations. Boys who would become drunkards merely through reading a whiskey advertisement are in a world that was never intended for beings so ill equipped. "Put on the whole armor of God", said St. Paul; and the armor he speaks of is the Christian character; an armor meant for attack as well as defence. This is a world of temptations within and without, daily, hourly. Our security is within ourselves or nowhere. The right discipline, taught us at first, and later applied by ourselves, will cause that some temptations shall be wholly outgrown, and others put in subjection. But the time will never come when temptations shall lose their power. As some are outgrown, our very progress will generate others. Life will always be a struggle; of which the issue will largely depend on the wisdom and perseverance with which the inward man is built up. A strong character, not an easy situa-

tion, is the ideal, not only of the Gospel, but of every moral discipline.

This, too, is the thought of the great Archbishop of York, the late Dr. Magee, Primate of England, when debating a local option bill, in the house of lords, in 1872: "I entertain the strongest dislike to the Permissive Bill. I cannot, perhaps, express it in a stronger form than by saying that, *if I must take my choice*—and such it seems to me is really the alternative offered by the Permissive Bill—whether England should be free or sober, I declare, strange as such a declaration may sound coming from one of my profession, that I should say it would be better that England should be free than that England should be *compulsorily* sober. I would distinctly prefer freedom to sobriety, because with freedom we might in the end attain sobriety; but in the other alternative we should eventually lose both freedom and sobriety".

Profound words, "free and sober"! What is this but a variant of Cowper's mighty phrase (in his hymn, "Hark, my soul, it is the Lord"), "free and faithful". Between them, these two words say everything.

If this seven-year-old child were being brought up with a proper regard for his parents, and in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, he would be in no danger from cinnamon cigarettes or the vender of them. If these three likely lads were rightly taught their duty to God, to their neighbor, and to themselves, they need fear no whiskey advertisements; nor their mother for them.

"The kingdom of God does not consist in the practice of this or that separate virtue, but in the choice of the highest good, which regulates individual acts" (Gould's St. Mark, 10.23, International Critical Commentary).

Our security is in character, not coddling.

II

There is a cognate line of thought, full of suggestion for our subject, to which I can do little more than call attention here. It is well presented in "Hauptprobleme der Ethik", by Professor Paul Hensel, of Erlangen University, in the last chapter, on "Ethik und Kultur". I give a free translation of the passages particularly in point.

"An increase in the number and magnitude of temptations is bound up with every forward step in social evolution. How petty do the temptations seem that the savage and semicivilized man has to struggle with, in comparison with the refined solicitations that throng upon us civilized men at every forward step.

"It is these considerations that have often led men to formulate the severest indictment against civilization itself; and many pious souls have sought escape out of the entire cultural milieu, to live as hermits or monks. . . . It is a question whether such a temptationless life deserves the term moral. . . . It is certain that it lacks an essential characteristic of the moral life, namely, the element of strife, and the activity of the ethical will in strife. The only temptation I am actually a match for, the only one my ethical will

has actually triumphed over, is that which I have confronted and conquered in real life. . . .

"Aristotle is quite right when he asserts that morality must approve itself in actual test; just as it is not enough, in order to be crowned victor, to be in possession of the strength, but the strength must descend into, and demonstrate itself in, the field of conflict.

"It is this very accumulation and multiplication of desirable objects, every one of which may become a snare, that civilization lays claim to and finds one of its highest values in. What Fichte deduced from the totality of the external world, namely, that it is all meant as material and field for the exercise of our moral faculty, holds good of the totality of civilization's advantages. Through civilization we attain an expansion and sweep that is wholly foreign to man in a state of nature. We have the possibility of being good, —and of being bad too,—in far richer measure than is possible to primitive man. Because of the bad possibilities, the effort is sometimes made to remove as many temptations as possible out of the life of the civilized man; but this effort is in direct contradiction to the claims and rights of the ethical domain. There may, indeed, be a pedagogical value in not exposing the immature ethical will to the full weight of the multiplied temptations presented by an advanced civilization; though, even so, that is a mean education which will pack its pupil, physically and morally, in cotton. One thing is sure; exemption from

temptation, if lasting, will produce no moral being."

This is a profound thought of Hensel's,—that the advance of civilization has an ethical import, offering an ethical advantage, and presenting an ethical danger. Some old sins may lose their hold; but new ones are born. The accomplished penman may turn forger: had he never learned to write, he would not have faced this temptation. The new temptations that arise, with progress, are both more numerous and more subtle than the original ones that they displace. It is perhaps because of this net increase in the weight and number of temptations that the earlier civilizations, starting out with so much virility and promise, finally came to grief. It is a fact, I think, that a robuster moral sense is needed to sustain a complicated and advancing society. Thus primitive men perish, when suddenly exposed to our advanced culture: they cannot bear up under our moral burden.

What, then, is our security, if we are not to take to the wilderness? It is certainly not in the multiplication of drastic laws, ever more numerous and more drastic. These cannot keep pace with the growing demands: they will break down or be burrowed through and through, and leave a moral chaos. Our one and only safe reliance is an ethical sense advancing in vigor and delicacy and certitude with life's advancing demands.

This is what our philosophies are deducing from painstaking study and observation of society. Yet nineteen hundred years ago Jesus was

in possession of this truth, seemingly without effort: "The kingdom of heaven", he said, "is within you". St. Paul developed the thought, teaching that Christians "walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. 8.4), and that the motive energy is "Christ in you".

Dr. Hensel goes on to illustrate this principle by a living example:

"The Temperance Movement in the United States proposes as its goal the prohibition of the traffic in alcoholic drink. So far as it claims social and hygienic grounds, the motive is laudable; but when predominantly ethical grounds are alleged, a sharp protest is called for. Whether the people that live and grow up in such a community actually possess the virtue of temperance can be decided only when they come into a situation where they are tempted to drink. Otherwise they derive as little moral advantage from their abstinence as the savage in the jungle from the fact that he has never been guilty of the dishonesty of tapping an electric wire to steal the current".

Hensel's thought is that the forcible elimination of the temptations that naturally come with advancing civilization is a lapse to a lower ethical and cultural level. Not the surgeon, but the good physician, is needed here;—better yet, the hygienist. Not the removal of temptation, but the strengthening of the moral nature, is the thing.

III

It is true that there are some who are unequal to the full measure of Christian liberty. Nietzsche

makes a distinction between what he calls "master morality" and "slave morality"; that is, a difference in the code of ethics for each class. His general treatment of the question is, like most of his philosophy, unbalanced. But the Gospel, in a sense, and perhaps the only true sense, contains some distinction of this kind, as follows:— Our Lord came as the example of the perfectly free man, the man physiologically and psychologically whole and sound. He came eating and drinking, fond of banquetings, and free from the rigor of the Baptist,—yet without excess.

Still, to those who are such slaves to their habits and infirmities that even his Good News cannot altogether free them, he enjoins that, if the right hand or foot be a cause of scandal, the offending member be cut off, even at the cost of going through life maimed. This might be called a form of "slave morality". But it was not given for all, nor for most,—surely not to those whom Christ had made free indeed, to whom the "master morality" of Jesus can apply.

It is true that the Church has had all the centuries to build up temperance on these large free lines. Yet, here and there, men continued to get drunk after eighteen hundred years of "drinking unto the Lord". The answer is that the church did much, and in fact all that the conditions under which men lived made possible. A civilization was being built up out of barbarism. Men were coarse, ignorant, pulsing with physical energies, without mental resources. Their indulgences were in keeping. The church could do so much,

and no more. But that "much" was very considerable indeed. The greater part of Christendom was made temperate. It was only the Teutonic peoples that drank to excess, and not all of them. And, among them, as soon as education and industry opened up new outlets, it was possible to grapple with intemperance, and other excesses. In fact, men, of themselves, under these better conditions, freely choose the way of moderation.

CHAPTER III

THE NEW AND LIVING WAY

I

The Jew was not so temperate in Bible times as he has been since. Rebukes for drunkenness are frequent in both the Old and the New Testament. Those rebukes would be without point for the Jews now. Just how common the misuse of drink then was it is hard to say; but it may have been commoner than is usually supposed. The Jewish people have acquired temperance through a long discipline; and it was not the discipline of total abstinence or prohibition. It was, largely, the discipline of religion. In this they called into exercise a principle profound and far-reaching, a principle that belongs as fully to Christianity, but which has been slurred by rigorism. The principle is: "Consecration, not Repression"; and it applies to everything not in itself wrong. If wine was debauched by some to evil, the ancient Hebrews rescued it by placing it in still closer connection with God. "Holy unto the Lord" they wrote over it; and over all else that was capable of it. It was the same fruitful wisdom as led the early Christian Church to take over and appropriate to Christian uses the anniversaries, buildings, and statues of paganism. The rigorist, on the other hand, where there is abuse, would repress. He has attempted it with the theatre, dancing,

cards. He is attempting it with drink. He is threatening it with tobacco. That was not the way of Jesus. He did not destroy: he made over, and consecrated by a new and living way. The Psalmist rightly differentiates men fiercely destructive in their wrath from the wise and patient Lord, *Though they curse, yet bless thou* (Ps. 109.27, Prayer Book). The Benedictine monks were acting on this principle, when they inscribed on their bottles of liqueur the D.O.M., "to God, Best, Greatest"; this was Consecration, not Repression. All that is not in itself evil, all that has possibilities of innocence and good, should be saved, amplified, and enriched by being brought into relation with God: the danger of excess is minimized by placing the act of drinking in a better setting and environment. The ancient Greeks and Romans poured out a small portion of their drink as a libation to the gods, before drinking themselves. Now, though there was much that was immoderate and immoral in their pantheon, may not the spirit of this act have had something to do with their high level of temperance?

In this spirit the Greek Church, in the marriage service, always reads as the Gospel the story of the Miracle at Cana of Galilee; and part of the marriage rite consists in the partaking of wine by bride and bridegroom. I think each sips the wine three times, with symbolic allusion to the Holy Trinity. This custom has a connection with Judaism; where, as we have seen, wine is used to consecrate the marriage.

It is no gain to temperance to substitute grape-juice for wine in the Holy Communion. Rather is it a surrender, an abandonment, to the enemy of useful ground. Less wine is not drunk; and what is drunk is, so far as this de-secration is known and attended to, drunk under a religious outlawry that can do only harm. Even the "Prosits", "Gesundheits", "Healths", "Prosperity" may have a social and spiritual value. What enhances fellowship is, so far, good: the world needs it; it is, in a way, sacramental. There is something more than a pleasantry in the saying that, while you have often seen a merry group laughing and joking over their glasses of beer or wine, no one ever saw a group of people making merry around the town pump.

Far more than eating, drinking is felt to be a social act, literally a *kindly* thing, which binds together, for the nonce, into a sort of family those who drink together. Witness the fine word symposium, "a drinking together". Cicero affected to disparage this Greek word for a festive gathering, as well as its Greek alternative "syndeipnon", "an eating together", in favor of the term employed by the Romans, "convivium", "a living together"; since a "living together" is so much more refined than a mere "drinking" or "eating" together. Now, while "syndeipnon" has been entirely lost to us, and "symposium" is perhaps oftener used in a literary sense, it is no accident that "convivium" has persisted only by taking over the sense of these two: "convivial" and "conviviality" invariably suggest merry-

making over food and drink. There has always, indeed, been a spiritual element making for brotherhood in the festive meal: and it has been more intimately connected with the drink than with the food;— perhaps for two reasons;—the first, that, while a hearty meal rather dulls the spirits, drink, on the contrary, enlivens them; and, second, drink,—say wine or mead or whatever it may be,—is a more highly artificial, that is, more human, product than food; since food can be prepared for the next meal directly from nature's materials, whereas drink requires weeks or months or years.

Thus it is that the rough convivialist who insists, on pain of trouble, that everybody shall drink with him, at his expense, is moved by an instinct that, at bottom, is healthy and fine: he is trying, in his crude way, to be "friends" with everybody, and to have everybody "friends" with him;—"that they may be one". This social instinct in drinking leads to serious abuse; but so does every other fine endowment of our nature; witness the reproductive instinct; or the artistic. How much better if this spontaneous "kindliness" could be brought under the sanction of the religious nature! Then it would be restrained and directed by a monitor that speaks with high authority, an authority that the world has always respected, and always will. Churches come and go. Creeds come and go. But the religious instinct abides. Happy we, if we can make it a joy forever! Happy, if we can use it, not primarily for repression, but for expression; that,

through its aid, men may have fuller joy, and fuller life, not on the spiritual plane alone, but on all planes; more joy in foods and drinks; yes, in baseball, in billiards and pool, in music, in becoming clothes and ornaments. All the natural instincts are to be consecrated to God. Nor does this mean that they must cease to be natural; it means that God must come down and take possession of them on their own levels. They must remain natural, and yet be God-filled,—"the merry harp, with the lute"; even the "bones", and "rag-time", and vaudeville, for those who find their satisfaction so. Always there will be those highest levels where but a few can dwell; which more can visit occasionally; which the many can only have glimpses of,—"One star differeth from another star in glory";—but each in his measure, after his kind, can live in God,—the sleight-of-hand man, the dancing women, the circus clowns. If it is not so now, we should make it so by consecration, rather than impossible by repression. Instead of "This or God", let us, where it can be done, make it "This and God"; for so life is added to. Not the renunciation of these pleasures of sense, but the conquest and use of them in the power of the spirit, is the thing. The Church should shelter and consecrate all these hazardous indulgences (not sinful), not only that they may be kept from doing harm, but that they may become instruments of positive good. Jesus himself lived, not on one plane only, but on many. He loved to pray; yet it is no derogation of his glory to speak of the wine-loving, food-loving, joy-

loving Jesus. It is significant that his robe was "seamless throughout": was it not of superior quality? And did he not enjoy the fragrance of the "oil of spikenard", as well as value the love that bestowed it? He loved to pray; he loved also to watch the children at their games. The religion of Jesus is not made joyous enough; and that is one reason why men seek their joys so largely outside it.

Jesus was responsive to all the satisfactions of life; yet in perfect control of them all. He could abound, and he could suffer want. His sensibilities were at once delicate and strong, refined and virile, simple and luxuriant,—the fibre of the gentleman, the child, the knight, the devotee, the hero, the woman, all harmoniously balanced. Religion must beware how it casts this prompting and that of our God-given nature into the outer darkness as common and unclean. Its real mission is not to destroy, but to save: "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved" (John 3.17). Not the water-drinking John, but the wine-drinking Jesus will the world be drawn to; not to John in the desert, but to Jesus in the busy ways of men; not to John in his rough camel's hair, but to Jesus in his seamless robe, woven from the top throughout; not to John subsisting on locusts, but to Jesus "eating and drinking".

II

Of the two, wine and water, wine was the pre-eminent symbol of our Lord. The water rite of

baptism was taken over from John the Baptist. The selection of the wine-drinking feast, as the special rite of his followers, was the ordinance of the Lord. There was also, perhaps, a peculiar appropriateness in each. Water-baptism was appropriate to the water-drinking John: wine and the joyous meal suitably expressed the joy given by the wine-drinking Christ. Water-baptism typified repentance, cleansing from sin: wine typified the joy and intoxication of spirit proceeding from him who is the True Vine. Repentance, symbolized by baptismal water, is a colder act than attachment to righteousness called forth by ardent love of Christ and ardent union with his spirit. Repentance, too, often comes from fear. Jesus introduced, as a means of salvation, a stronger emotional force, that of joy, salvation by joy. Recall how, in St. John, these four bright glad words recur, "light", "life", "joy", "love",—

> "the rivers four that gladden,
> With their streams, the better Eden
> Planted by our Lord most dear".

This was a new thing in the history of the soul, this salvation through gladness; and Christians themselves have been slow, not to say loth, to learn it; perhaps because it seemed too good to be true. Yet surely joyous attachment to goodness will do more than cold repentance. The new note of salvation by joy distinguishes the mission of Jesus from that of John. The least in the kingdom of the wine-drinking Christ was

greater than the greatest of the followers of water-drinking John, because a new enthusiasm was theirs, an enthusiasm for holiness through union with Christ that showed forth all the gifts and graces of the Spirit of Holiness. In the new rite the festal banquet best typified the spirit of Jesus,—the bread, the solid nourishment of life; and the wine, the joy of life,—and both proceeding from Jesus. The Son of Man came "eating and drinking". This banquet-loving Christ became the bearer of the religion of joy that was to conquer the world. When the world falls from salvation, it is too often from lack of joy. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to me" (John 12.32) means: "If I,—the wine-drinking, joy-loving Christ,—be lifted up, I will draw all men to me". Religion in this land is not the power it might be today, because the rigorist, influential beyond his numbers, is lifting up the water-drinking John the Baptist in place of the wine-drinking Christ. No wonder the world does not respond. The water-drinking John did not draw the world to him: the whole world, almost, has followed the wine-drinking Christ. When we realize all the aspects of the religion of joy founded by Christ, we shall have found the method for the salvation of the world. Jesus, as the frequenter of banquets, as the drinker and the provider of wine, as the delighted watcher of the child actors and dancers in the market-place, as the founder of the festal and wine-drinking memorial of himself, so naturally and beautifully

named the Eucharist, "the thing of joy and grace", the emblem of man's sustenance and joy, gives us the key to the solution of our social problems. The children in the market-place, we have been told, typified John and Jesus,—John playing funeral, calling to repentance, and beating the breast;—Jesus playing wedding, piping and bidding us dance. Such was the difference between the new dispensation and the old covenant of the law, which lasted till John. A fresco in the Catacombs accordingly portrays Christ as Orpheus, magically charming and attracting all by his music. Dean Stanley even says ("Christian Institutions," Chap. XIII.) that among these Christian decorations is "Bacchus as the God of the vintage".

This motive of joy is given its proper place as the dominant note of the entire Christian career in the second collect for Easter Day in the Episcopal Prayer Book,—"Grant us so to die daily from sin, that we may EVERMORE LIVE WITH HIM IN THE JOY OF HIS RESURRECTION".

Even in the primitive church there were some who knew only the baptism of John (Acts 18.25); who had not so much as heard *whether the Holy Spirit was given* (Acts 19.2). When they were told of it, these *were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. And, when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them* (Acts 19.3-6).

Rigorism today seems largely to know only the baptism of John the water-drinker, not that of Christ the wine-drinker, with its enthusiasm and

fulness of the Spirit. John himself called attention to the contrast: *I baptized you in water; but he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit* (Mark 1.8). The baptism of the one was a cold douche: the baptism of the other was the baptism of fire, which, even while it cleanses, fills with enthusiasm, with love and joy and peace and inspiration. John's teaching still left men in bondage to the law, and encouraged his water-drinking example. The truth in Christ set men free from all this bond-service, and made them free indeed: *If therefore the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed* (John 8.36). But this freedom is not mere wilfulness: it is a new service to saving love and joy and peace and truth.

III

The rationale of the greater success of Christ's secret of joy is that it secures, in the best and most effective manner, all that is called for in life in the way of self-renouncement. Self-renouncement, taking up the cross daily, the royal way of the Holy Cross, are preeminent characteristics of the true Christian life. But their truest and most effective source is joy. For love of a woman, a young man will often practice any extent of self-denial. Ardent love of Christ has enabled countless martyrs to bear tortures and death. And the spirit of joy, by brightening and warming and inspiring life, is the greatest power to lift man out of degradation, selfishness, and sin. The Apostle even does not scruple to ascribe this joy as a motive of Jesus;

"who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising shame" (Heb. 12.2),—the deep and stimulating joy of Jesus. The one-time foolish and giddy girl often becomes a dignified and decorous matron, when the joy of motherhood has given her a new motive for life. And is not this, too, that saying which He spake unto us, being yet present with us, "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light"?

And so, in numerous instances, does innocent joy save, and give power to practise every self-denial that life calls for. The Beatitudes ring out, in each verse, the note of joy, "Blessed, Fortunate, Happy". It is a profound saying of Goethe's, too, that "We possess only what we enjoy".

Of the mighty power of joy there is no more universal symbol than that given by Jesus,—the wine-cup and the banquet; because the meal is a daily reality, and at the same time one of the simplest, oftenest repeated, and most familiar acts. It is significant that Jesus did not build up his discipleship about a book;—the New Testament, as yet, was not;—nor about a priestly order; nor about a "great renunciation"; but about a banquet, a feast of eating and drinking, bread to strengthen man's heart, and wine that maketh his heart glad, true bread and true wine, both alike for the strengthening and refreshing of body and soul alike.

Protestantism once raised a fierce outcry against the church of Rome for withholding the cup from the laity, even alleging that this vitiated

the nature of the sacrament, which dealt with the blood, as well as the body, of Christ. Today rigorism is seeking to take the cup, as Christ drank of it, away from laity and clergy alike.

The Gospel, God's News, is a Good News for both body and soul, a message, not of repression, but of lawful sovereignty,—"All [things] are yours, and ye are Christ's" (1 Cor. 3.22). "All things are yours" that do not deny you to Christ. Drink is one of these privileges of the children of God, by the witness of him who is Faithful and True; who both himself drank and commended and commanded it to his followers. Drink is right as long as it is our creature; ours to let alone, ours to take up. It is only when it ceases to be ours, and, contrariwise, becomes our master, that drink becomes wrong.

CONCLUSION

I

The Old Testament, Jesus, the New Testament, and the Universal Church all concur in blessing drink as a good gift of God. Can there be any higher sanction of right than this? If these four witnesses of righteousness were in this,—all of them,—wrong, then every moral certitude goes. If these did not know, how can you or I?

The verdict of religion and the church in favor of drink, throughout the ages and throughout the world, was so little questioned that no opposition to it was even thought of,—till modern times,—since the primitive ascetics. Even in modern times that opposition has been confined mainly to the habitats of rigorists,—who in their characteristic bent reproduce those ascetics. The mark of both is the distortion of a truth, namely the superior claims of the soul over the body, of eternity over time. The consummation of this distortion is Manichaeism, the 3d Century heresy of Mani; who taught that the body is the product of the kingdom of darkness, or evil; and that the soul is the product of the kingdom of light, or good. Consequently all that ministers to the evil body is itself evil. In the same spirit, the rigorist has a tendency to look with suspicion on these lower satisfactions, and to disallow them, as far as he can. If the lower satisfaction is not an

obvious necessity, and if it easily lends itself to abuse, its doom is soon pronounced thus: "It is not needed; it may do harm; what more need be said?"

What more need be said? Just this: "Every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer" (1 Tim. 4.4).

The opponents of drink as sinful fill the press, the platform, and many a pulpit with their denunciations. Over large sections of the country they prevail in legislation. But the truth of God and of his Church is not with them; and therefore they cannot last. Remember, again, the words of Joubert: "The austere sects excite the most enthusiasm at first; but the temperate sects have always been the most durable".

God's Word and God's Church teach, directly in respect of wine and what they call "strong drink", and by necessary inference of all drinks no more hazardous,—

1.—That it is right to drink.
2.—That it is right to buy drink.
3.—That it is right to sell drink.
4.—That it is right to make drink.

Only, let everything be done decently and in order. And let a man take heed how he drink.

II

I cannot close this book better than by quoting again, as best summing up the teaching of Bible

and Church on the subject of drink, the mightiest preacher that the Christian ages have produced, —St. Chrysostom,—St. John of the Golden-Tongue,—Bishop, Saint, Martyr, Ascetic (347-407 A. D.).—

"Shun excess and drunkenness and gluttony. For God gave meat and drink, not for excess, but for nourishment. For it is not the wine that produces drunkenness; for, if that were the case, everybody would needs be drunken".—St. Chrysostom, Homily 20 on Second Corinthians.

"Not that to drink wine is shameful. God forbid! For such precepts belong to heretics".—St. Chrysostom, Concerning the Statues, Homily 1.7.

"Timothy had overthrown the strength of his stomach by fasting and water-drinking. Paul, having said before, 'Drink no longer water', then brings forward his counsel as to the drinking of wine".—Concerning the Statues, Homily 1.8.

"For wine was given us by God, not that we might be drunken, but that we might be sober. . . . It is the best medicine, when it has the best moderation to direct it. The passage before us [Paul's advice to Timothy to 'drink a little wine'] is useful also against heretics, who speak evil of God's creatures; for, if it [wine] had been among the number of things forbidden, Paul would not have permitted it, nor would have said it was to be used. And not only against the heretics, but against the simple ones among our brethren, who, when they see any persons disgracing themselves from drunkenness, instead of reproving such, blame the fruit given them by

God, and say, 'Let there be no wine'. We should say then in answer to such, 'Let there be no drunkenness; for wine is the work of God, but drunkenness is the work of the devil. Wine makes not drunkenness; but intemperance produces it. Do not accuse that which is the workmanship of God [wine], but accuse the madness of a fellow-mortal'. Otherwise you . . . are treating your Benefactor with contempt.

"When, therefore, we hear men saying such things, we should stop their mouths; for it is not the use of wine, but the want of moderation, that produces drunkenness, that root of all evils. Wine was given to restore the body's weakness, not to overturn the soul's strength. . . . For what is a more wretched thing than drunkenness! The drunken man is a living corpse.—Concerning the Statues, Homily 1 11-12.

"For instance, I hear many say, when these excesses happen [women's getting drunk and shaming themselves in public], 'Would there were no wine'. O folly, O madness! When other men sin, do you find fault with God's gifts? And what great madness is this? What! Did the wine, O man, produce this evil? Not the wine, but the intemperance of such as take an evil delight in it. Say, then, 'Would there were no drunkenness, no luxury'; but, if you say, 'Would there were no wine', you will say, going on by degrees, 'Would there were no steel, because of the murderers; no night, because of the thieves; no light, because of the informers; no women, because of adulteries'; and, in a word, you will

destroy everything. But do not so; for this is of a satanical mind. Do not find fault with the wine, but with the drunkenness. And, when you have found this self-same man sober, sketch out all his unseemliness, and say to him, 'Wine was given that we might be cheerful, not that we might behave ourselves unseemly; that we might laugh, not that we might be a laughing-stock; that we might be healthy, not that we might be diseased; that we might correct the weakness of our body, not cast down the might of our soul.' "—St. Chrysostom, on the Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 57.5.

THERE, IN THAT QUARTER, LIES THE MORNING!

INDEX

Alcohol, 229-235
Ales, 160
Ambrose, 148
Apocrypha, 45
Apostles, 103
Apostolical Constit., 144
Aquarians, 138
Archbishop Magee, 198, 274
Aristotle, 276
Asbury, Francis, 178
Asceticism, 135
Athanasius, 145
Augustine, St., 152

Bacchus, 289
Baptism, 286
Banquet, 291
Baptist Churches, 189
Basil, 146
Beet, Rev. Dr., 108, 256
Benedictine, 161, 282
Bible and Drink, 6-130
Buddha, 243
Bunyan, 166

Caesarea, 147
Calvin, 79
Canons, Holy Apostles, 144
Catholic, 185, 195, 236
Character and Coddling, 269
Charity, Christian, 105-128
Chartreuse, 162
Christian Denomination, 190
Christendom, population, 201
Chrysostom, St., 149, 295
Church, The, 131, 196, 211, 215, 221, 226-236, 279
Church and Drink Traffic, 264
"Churches in Action," 188, 197, 263
Church in England, 198
Cities and Prohibition, 208-210
Clement of Alex., 140
Coke, Rev. Thos., 178
Congregational Chs., 189
Consecration vs. Repression, 281
Convivial, 283
Corinth., Ch. of, 97-101, 104
Council, 1st Ch., 128
Country and Prohib., 208
Crafts, Rev. Dr., 219
Cyprian of Carthage, 144

Defoe, 166, 168
Divorce, 211
Dixon, Prof., 241, 243
Drink, meaning, 3
consumption of, 218
traffic, 264
Drunkenness, 129, 223

Edersheim, Dr., 94
Eichhorn, Dr., 122
Encratites, 138, 142
Encyclo., Bib., 71
Encyclo., Brit., on Drink, 232
England, 198, 200, 274
Episcopal Ch., 185, 191
Epistles, 97
Eucharist, 289
Eucken, 260
Europe, 219

Family, 211
Fathers, The, 140
Fermentation, 63
Finland, 185
Force, 248
French Canadian, 216
"Fruit of the Vine," 88, 92-95

Geikie, Dr., 94
Gladstone, 238
Gleukos, 69
Goldsmith, 166, 168
Good Samaritan, 74
Gospels, 68
Grape Juice Unferm., 63, 87, 89, 93, 198, 201, 283
Greek Ch., 195, 282

Hailperin, Rabbi, 63, 90-93
Harnack, Prof., 132-133
Hastings' Bib. Dic. on Wine, 71, 104

Hensel, Prof., 275
Hirsch, Rev. M. A. L., 195
Humanitarianism, 269

Industrial Condit., 227
Intemperance, 223, 259
Irenæus, 140

Jerome, 149
Jesus, 75-83, 95, 97, 242, 248, 286
on the cross, 74
the norm, 137
way of, 268
Jesus ben Sirach, 45-49
Jewish Ency., 60, 64
Jews, 196, 281
and Pass. Wine, 86-93
John Baptist,
68, 75, 287-289, 290
Jones, Prof., 267
Josephus, 57
Joubert, 138, 294
Joy as Motive, 284-291

Kansas, 211-215
Knox, John, 164

Labor, Organized, 227
Lambeth Conference, 200
Law, 244-264, 290
Levias, Prof., 88
London, 223
Lord's Supper, 82, 96, 177, 283
Love Feast, 98-101
Luther, Martin, 125, 164
Lutherans, 185, 195-196

Maccabees, 50
Magee, Archbish., 198, 274
Maine, 211-215
Manichæans, 152, 293
Marcionites, 146
Marriage, 213
at Cana, 77, 282
nuptial Mass, 162, 282
Methodism, 171-182, 188
Middle Ages, 159
Milwaukee, 215
Minnesota, 213
Mohammed, 239, 243
Monks, 160
Moravians, 190

Nazirite, 17, 68
Nebraska, 211
Newark, N. J., 169
New Hampshire, 209, 216
New Jersey, 211-215, 249
Nietzsche, 278
Non-Conformity, 198
North Dakota, 211, 216

Oinos, 69 and following
Oklahoma, 216
Orange, 1st Pres. Ch. of, 170
Orpheus, 289

Passover, 83, 88, 91-94
Patrick, St., 159
Paul,
72-73, 97-128, 130, 155, 254
Pennsylvania, 211, 216
Peter, 103
Pfleiderer, Prof., 258
Philo, 51
Pilgrim's Progress, 166
Popes, 164, 195
Potter, Bishop, 194
Presbyt. Church, 188-189
Priests, to Abstain, 17
Primitive Ch., 131, 155-157
Prohibition, 204
Public House, 237
Pulpit, 229
Puritans, 169, 185-186, 197, 204

Rabbinic Lit., 60
Rainsford, Dr., 194
Rechabites, 18
Reformation, 164
Reformed (Dutch) Ch., 190
Religion and Law ,244
Religious Instinct, 284
Rhode Island, 209
Richmond, Va., 250
Rigorism, 125-126, 188, 202-203,
268-269, 281, 286, 288,
289, 292, 293
Robinson Crusoe, 166, 168
Roman Catholic, 194
Rum, Medford, 169

Scandinavia, 185
Schaff-Herzog Ency., 66, 95
Scheiwiler, Prof., 185
Science, 232, 241-243

Self-sacrifice, 290
Septuagint, 44
Shadwell, Dr., 232
Slavery, 182
Smollett, 223
South, The, 209
Spurgeon, Chas. H., 264
Stanley, Dean, 95, 289
State, The, 128, 244
"Strong Drink," 14
Swiss Family Rob., 166, 168
"Symposium," 283

Tabus, 136
Taming of the Shrew, 163
Tatian, 132
Tea, Wesley on, 176
Teaching of the Twelve, 133
Temp. Movement, 185, 205, 278
Temptation, 272
Teutonic, 280
Theocracy, 169, 206-208, 250
Tirosh, 37-41, 42
Total Abstinence, 185, 201-202, 239
True Temp. Assoc., 237
Twenty-third Psalm, 42
Two Ways, The, 267

Vicar of Wakefield, 168
Vulgate, 63

Water in Eucharist, 131
Webb, Bishop, 193
Weak Brother, Paul's, 105-128, 155
Wesleys, The, 171-177, 190
Whitefield, Rev. Geo., 177
Wine, in Hebrew, 10, 63
Greek, 68
Bib. Dict., 60, 64, 66-67
Wisconsin, 213-215
Wyss, 168

Yayin, 11-36, 49-50

DREW UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
3 1144 00519914 5

Date Due

WITHDRAWN

DREW UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
MADISON, NEW JERSEY 07940